

The *Amores* of Propertius: Unity and Structure in Books 2–4

JAMES L. BUTRICA

From the thirteenth century to the nineteenth, manuscripts first and then editions unanimously presented the elegies of Propertius in four groups labelled Books 1–4. In 1816, however, Karl Lachmann challenged that arrangement with three arguments: (1) that certain passages in Ovid and Fulgentius implied that some lines had been lost; (2) that Propertius 2. 13. 25–26,

sat mea sat magna est, si tres sint pompa libelli
quos ego Persephona maxima dona feram,

are inconceivable anywhere but in the poet's third book of elegies; and (3) that 2. 10 could only have appeared at the beginning of a new book dedicated to Augustus.¹ Accordingly he made 2. 10 the beginning of a

¹ *Sex. Aurelii Propertii Carmina*, ed. by K. Lachmann (Leipzig 1816) xx–xxiii. The following works will be cited by author's name (or author's name and abbreviated title) only: T. Birt, *Das antike Buchwesen* (Berlin 1882); B. K. Gold, "Propertius 3. 9: Maecenas as *Eques, Dux, Fautor*," in *Literary and Artistic Patronage in Ancient Rome*, ed. by B. K. Gold (Austin 1982); B. K. Gold, *Literary Patronage in Greece and Rome* (Chapel Hill 1987); M. Hubbard, *Propertius* (New York 1975); S. J. Heyworth, "Propertius 2. 13," *Mnem.* 45 (1992) 45–59; S. J. Heyworth, "Propertius: Division, Transmission, and the Editor's Task," *PLLS* 8 (1995) 165–85; G. O. Hutchinson, "Propertius and the Unity of the Book," *JRS* 74 (1984) 99–106; R. O. A. M. Lyne, *The Latin Love Poets from Catullus to Horace* (Oxford 1980); E. P. Menes, "The External Evidence for the Division of Propertius, Book 2," *CP* 78 (1983) 136–53; D. Ross, *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry* (Cambridge 1975); O. Skutsch, "The Second Book of Propertius," *HSCP* 79 (1975) 229–33; B. L. Ullman, "The Book Division of Propertius," *CP* 4 (1909) 45–51; W. Wimmel, *Kallimachos in Rom*, *Hermes Einzelschriften* 16 (Wiesbaden 1960); M. Wyke, "Written Women: Propertius' *scripta puella*," *JRS* 77 (1987) 47–61; and the editions or commentaries of Rothstein (Berlin 1898), Butler and Barber (Oxford 1933), W. A. Camps (Book 2, Cambridge 1967; Book 3, Cambridge 1966; Book 4, Cambridge 1965), P. J. Enk (Book 2, Leiden 1962), P. Fedeli (Book 3, Bari 1987; complete text, Stuttgart 1984), and G. P. Goold (Cambridge, MA 1990). Texts and translations are my own. The literature on most of the Propertian poems treated here is considerable; it has therefore been necessary to limit citation to the most important or most recent discussions, and the already substantial bulk of this study precludes detailed refutation of all contrary opinions. The content of the first part of this paper was originally presented at the 1982 annual meeting of the American Philological Association under the title, "The Propertian Corpus in Antiquity"; oral versions of the entire paper were presented at a conference for the retirement of Alexander McKay at McMaster University in 1990 and (as part of a paper entitled "The Art and Architecture of Propertius") at the Leeds International Latin Seminar in 1993. Thanks are owed to all who made constructive

new third book, and this disposition largely held the field,² except in editions which treated the text still more roughly,³ until 1880, the *annus mirabilis* as Housman called it, when Arthur Palmer and Emil Baehrens independently⁴ restored the division into four books, which has prevailed ever since. Soon after, however, Theodor Birt offered the first serious investigation of the ancient citations of Propertius, and claimed that they supported Lachmann's division into five books.⁵ Subsequent discussions of these citations have been dominated by this issue, and have concentrated upon the debated division of Book 2 to the exclusion of what those citations can tell us about Propertius' own arrangement of his elegies.⁶ Lachmann's theory has enjoyed a renewed popularity and has even been declared "fact" by the most recent editor of Propertius.⁷ Meanwhile the mistaken notion that Books 1–3 were published together has achieved a comparable currency, especially among Ovidian scholars discussing connections between Propertius and the *Amores*.⁸

This paper has two parts. The first offers a new interpretation of the evidence furnished by the ancient citations, arguing that Propertius' four books circulated as two works, a one-book collection called *Cynthia*, now

comments on those occasions, as to the *ICS* referees as well; none of these, however, could save me from such delusions as remain.

² The principal exceptions are Paldam (Halle 1827) and Hertzberg (Halle 1843–45).

³ Carutti's (The Hague 1869), for example, which rearranged and redistributed the elegies.

⁴ In fact their independence was perhaps not absolute; Palmer, who visited Groningen in 1878, mentions in his preface "suavia colloquia cum Aemilio Baehrensis de rebus Propertianis et Catullianis habita" (*Sex. Propertii Elegiarum Libri IV*, ed. by A. Palmer [Dublin 1880] vi).

⁵ Birt 413–26.

⁶ As can be seen, for example, in the titles of the articles by Menes and Skutsch (above, note 1).

⁷ Goold 16: "But the fact is that Propertius composed five books of elegies, our Book Two being the extant remains of two books." For other sympathetic opinions, cf. Hubbard 41: "Lachmann reasonably inferred that we have in Book II the remains of two books, one certainly defective, one perhaps complete"; L. Richardson, Jr., *Propertius Elegies I–IV* (Norman 1977) 20: "It looks as though Book 2 might be a conflation of the beginning of one book and the end of another"; J. P. Sullivan, *Propertius: A Critical Introduction* (Cambridge 1976) 7: "the three books that presently comprise our Books 2 and 3"; Heyworth, "Propertius: Division" 165–71. Two authors have independently tried to resolve the problem (in favour of division) on purely literary grounds, J. K. King, "Propertius 2. 1–12: His Callimachean Second 'libellus,'" *WJA* 6 (1980) 61–84 and B. A. Heiden, "Book-Division within Propertius Book II," *QUCC* 11 (1982) 151–69. Both, along with Heyworth and Goold, would begin the new book at 2. 13 rather than at 2. 10. P. Keyser's "The Length and Scansion of Propertius II as Evidence for Book Division," *Philologus* 136 (1992) 81–88, argues weakly against a division.

⁸ The suggestion was first made by G. Williams, *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry* (Oxford 1968) 480–95; see also J. A. Barsby, "The Composition and Publication of the First Three Books of Propertius," *G&R* 21 (1974) 128–37; I. M. Le M. Duquesnay, "The *Amores*," in *Ovid*, ed. by J. W. Binns (London 1973) 1–48, on the unity of *Amores* and their likeness to Propertius 1–3 (6: "Perhaps the most significant aspect of the *Amores* when viewed as a single collection is Ovid's obvious desire to recall to the reader the first three books of Propertius"); and note the cautious acceptance in *Ovid. Amores*, ed. by J. C. McKeown (Liverpool 1987) I 90: "Ovid is perhaps inviting comparison with Prop. 1–3." Skutsch 229 refuted the idea by noting that 2. 24. 2 *toto Cynthia lecta Foro* shows that "the Cynthia Book was published before Book II" and that Propertius is hardly likely to have dedicated the first book of such a collection to the obscure Tullus and only the second to Maecenas.

known as Book 1, and a three-book collection comprising Books 2–4, probably called *Amores*. The second attempts to bolster that interpretation with internal arguments for the unity of the presumed Propertian *Amores*.

I

Ancient evidence for how Propertius arranged his four books is relatively plentiful, but it must be noted that the numbering of the books given by the manuscript tradition is not part of that evidence: The archetype contained no titles of any sort and did not even name the author.⁹ This means that none of the headings found in the manuscripts originated in antiquity with the author himself. The habit of referring to “Book 1,” “Book 2,” and so forth is so deeply ingrained (and enshrined in lexicæ and reference works) that it cannot be emphasized too strongly that these designations utterly lack manuscript authority. Two mediaeval manuscripts survive. Of these N (Wolfenbüttel Gud. lat. 224, written perhaps around 1200) begins simply with the phrase, “Incipit Propertius”; even this, however, was not copied along with the text but was added later by the second scribe (who, of course, recovered the poet’s name from the text, as the simple “Propertius,” rather than “Sextus Propertius,” suggests); this second hand itself finished with a simple “Explicit Propertius.” There are no other titles at all, and the fact that no space was provided for them (except at the start of Books 3 and 4) strongly suggests that the exemplar likewise had none. The second mediaeval copy, the Leiden fragment A (Universiteitsbibliotheek Voss. lat. O. 38, written about 1240 and extant only as far as 2. 1. 63), is the first manuscript to offer titles for the work as a whole and for individual poems, and the first to give a fuller form of the poet’s name. Its general title, “Incipit monobiblos propercii aurelii naute ad tullum,” has been patched together from two sources: “Ad tullum” comes from 1. 1. 9, “Monobiblos” from the lemma to Martial 14. 189 (on which see below). The title affixed to 2. 1. 1, “Incipit liber secundus ad mecenatem” (that is, presumably, “the second book of the monobiblos”), suggests that its inventor was the first in a long line of scholars to misinterpret monobiblos, for a monobiblos cannot contain a second book (see below). The titles of individual poems in the surviving portion of A are predictably of the *Ad X* variety (but note that their inventor did not read far enough into 1. 14 to find Tullus’ name and so called it *Ad Diuitem*). In the remainder, where A must be reconstructed from descendants, the titles of several elegies are based upon errors impossible in antiquity (2. 22 was called *Ad Heremium*, from a misreading of *here mi* in the first line as the vocative of Heremius; 3. 14 became *Ad Spartum* from a misunderstanding of *Sparte* in the first line as the vocative of Spartus). The name “Propertius Aurelius Nauta” is an equally

⁹ For what follows, see J. L. Butrica, *The Manuscript Tradition of Propertius*, Phoenix Suppl. 17 (Toronto 1984) 24–25.

imaginative creation, combining one of the poet's real names (Propertius), a second name ("Nauta") derived from a corruption of 2. 24. 38 (*navita diues eras*, where all editions now incorporate Beroaldus' conjecture *non ita*), and a third of uncertain origin ("Aurelius," perhaps from proximity to Aurelius Prudentius in an alphabetical catalogue of poets). This name and all the titles can surely be ascribed to Richard de Fournival, for whom the manuscript was copied. To understand how Propertius himself arranged and titled his books of elegies we must rely solely upon the ancient secondary sources.

The first of these is Martial 14. 189, an epigram describing a book to be given as a gift, under the reliably ancient lemma¹⁰ *Monobiblos Properti*:

Cynthia, facundi carmen iuvenale Properti,
accepit famam, nec minus ipsa dedit.

This is generally (and correctly) interpreted as referring to a copy of what we know as Book 1. Cynthia's name begins the epigram exactly as it begins Book 1 (in fact it is likely that "Cynthia" here represents not the poet's mistress but the title of his monobiblos; see below). The reference to "youthful poetry" can be taken in one of two ways, both of which point to Book 1. It might suggest that the work in question is Propertius' earliest work (which would of course be Book 1), or that it is his most ardently "youthful" work and the one most concerned with youthful activity like love (again Book 1). Given the reasonable conclusion that Martial has Book 1 in mind here, the knowledge that he identified that book as "Propertius' Monobiblos" is a vital clue to the arrangement of the elegies, for it shows, first of all, that what we customarily call Book 1 could not have been "Book 1" of anything. Propertian scholars have defined "monobiblos" in many ways: Williams claimed that it was "a small, self-contained section of an author" suitable for a Saturnalia present;¹¹ Menes that it was "a separate and detached part of the original collection";¹² Goold that it was "a collection of the poet's work, and most obviously an anthology";¹³ Heyworth (who suggests that it could have contained the entire Propertian corpus) that it was "a bookseller's edition";¹⁴ Horsfall that it was "a specialised term applied to a specific form of composition,

¹⁰ Happily the antiquity of the lemmata in Book 14 is guaranteed by Martial himself at 14. 2. 3: *lemmata si quaeris cur sint adscripta*.

¹¹ Williams, *Tradition and Originality* (above, note 8) 483. Perhaps he was influenced by the unsupported claim of Enk that "Titulus 'Monobiblos' nihil docet nisi hoc Martialis temporibus nostrum primum librum separatim ab aliis venalem fuisse" (*Sex. Propertii Elegiarum Liber I*, ed. by P. J. Enk [Leiden 1946] 25–26).

¹² Menes 137.

¹³ Goold 17–18.

¹⁴ Heyworth, "Propertius: Division" 178: "the *Monobiblos* will . . . be a bookseller's edition of Propertius"; cf. also 177: "whether it contains all of Propertius' five books or a selection we cannot say."

apparently applicable, unlike 'monograph,' to prose and verse alike."¹⁵ All of these definitions except Horsfall's involve the highly implausible proposition that Martial's versified gift catalogue included whatever random slice of Propertius the bookseller happened to have available. For an accurate definition in a Propertian context one must turn to the overlooked Addenda to the introduction of Butler and Barber's commentary, where the word is correctly defined as a "'single book,' i.e. a work contained in one roll and complete in itself" (lxxxiv). The correct definition can also be found elsewhere, including Luciano Canfora's *The Vanished Library*, where it is called a book "in which a single scroll contains the entire work," that is, a work consisting of one and only one book and therefore occupying a single book roll.¹⁶ Strictly speaking it is an unnecessary coinage, since *liber*, βιβλίον, or βιβλίδιον can convey the same meaning. Its later popularity might be due to simple linguistic "inflation" (cf. the current replacement of "now" by "at this point in time"), but it is also possible that, as terms like *liber* and βιβλίον became virtual synonyms of *opus* and so could signify works comprising several *libri* or βιβλία, it was increasingly employed to distinguish an author's one-book work(s) from his collections, as I believe Martial does here. This meaning of monobiblos is the one that would be expected from etymology (μόνος = *unus*, βιβλος = *liber*) and from analogy with similar compounds such as τρίβιβλος (a work in three books) and τετράβιβλος (a work in four books).¹⁷ It is confirmed from usage in passages where monobibloi or monobibla are contrasted with works comprising more than one book, for which the usual term is σύνταξις, σύνταγμα, or πραγματεία. Thus Jerome, *Epistles* 33. 4. 4 enumerates among the works of Origen *tomos v* (sc. on the *Lamentations* of Jeremiah), *item monobibla*, *Periarchon libros iv*, etc., a five-book work on *Lamentations* (rather than five separate treatises), various single-book works, and a tetrabiblos. The *Suda* entry for the physician Philagrius enumerates his works as "seventy monobibla and many collections besides" (βιβλία ἰατρικὰ μονόβιβλα μὲν ο', συντάγματα δὲ ἕτερα οὐκ ὀλίγα).

¹⁵ N. Horsfall, "Some Problems of Titulature in Roman Literary History," *BICS* 28 (1981) 109.

¹⁶ L. Canfora, *The Vanished Library*, transl. by M. Ryle (London 1989) 187. See also T. Birt, "Zur Monobiblos und zum Codex N des Properz," *RhM* 64 (1909) 393–411, at 393–400; R. Devreesse, *Introduction à l'étude des manuscrits grecs* (Paris 1954) 68–69; B. Afsalos, *La terminologie du livre-manuscrit à l'époque byzantine. Première partie: Termes désignant le livre-manuscrit et l'écriture* (Thessalonica 1971) 65–66.

¹⁷ As a noun, tribiblos is attested only in the fourteenth century, in the introduction to the *Astronomy* of Theodorus Meliteniotes (τῆς παρούσης συντάξεως, ἥπερ ἀστρονομικὴ τρίβιβλος τοῦνομα); Latin writers prefer simply *libri tres*, Greek writers βιβλία γ', but Galen refers to a τρίβιβλος πραγματεία in his *Ars Medica* (*Opera Omnia*, ed. by C. G. Kühn [Leipzig 1826; repr. Hildesheim 1965] I 408). Tetrabiblos is familiar from the popular "title" of Ptolemy's *Apotelesmatica*; Galen's reference to a τετράβιβλον ἐτέραν at VII 311 Kühn implies the existence of two more; and Michael Psellus calls the first part of the *Digest* a τετράβιβλος σύνταξις. For these compounds, as well as πεντάβιβλος, ἐξαβιβλος, ἐπτάβιβλος, ὀκτάβιβλος, etc., see Afsalos (previous note) 61–65.

Several dozen works are identified in ancient literature as monobibloi, monobibla, or monobiblia. Many of these are philosophical in nature. Olympiodorus' commentary on Aristotle's *Meteorologica* mentions two monobibloi of Aristotle, one *περὶ μετᾱλλῶν* (6. 6), the other *περὶ χυμῶν* (162. 15). The anonymous philosophical *prolegomena* contained in Paris, B.N. gr. 1973 refer to a monobiblion of Aristotle *περὶ οἰκονομίας ἀρίστης* (f. 17b), while the pseudo-Ammonian biography of Aristotle says that he wrote to Alexander *περὶ βασιλείας* in one monobiblos. The catalogue of Aristotle's works preserved at Diogenes Laertius 5. 22–27 does not use the term monobiblos, but it does use numerals to indicate the number of books that each work comprised; this attributes to Aristotle a total of ninety-nine monobibloi, and confirms that the monobiblion *περὶ οἰκονομίας* and the monobiblos *περὶ βασιλείας* mentioned above did indeed consist of a single book. Olympiodorus' commentary on Plato's *Phaedo* mentions a monobiblos by Ammonius on a passage of that dialogue (8. 17); and Ammonius' commentary on the *Prior Analytics* contains extracts from his own monobiblos on hypothetical syllogisms (67. 32). Elias' commentary on Aristotle's *Categories* mentions a monobiblos *περὶ τῶν ἀλόγων γραμμάτων* written by τις τῶν Πυθαγορείων (125. 12). Monobibloi by the Aristotelian commentator Alexander are mentioned by Johannes Philoponus in his commentary on the *Prior Analytics* (13. 2) and by Michael in his commentary on the *Nicomachean Ethics* (584. 3). Simplicius' commentary on Aristotle's *De caelo* attributes to Ptolemy a monobiblion *περὶ διαστάσεως* (7. 9) and to Straton a monobiblion *περὶ τοῦ προτέρου καὶ ὑστέρου* (8. 418). Nemesius (*De nat. hom.* 584A) says that Iamblichus wrote a monobiblos arguing against inter-species transmigration of souls. Photius refers to a monobiblos *κατὰ Θεοδώρου* by Themistius (cod. 108, 88b39). Proclus in his commentary on Plato's *Republic* says that Naumachius wrote a monobiblos *περὶ τῆς ἀναβιώσεως* (2. 329). He himself wrote several, including *De malorum substantia* and another, mentioned without its title in his *Theologia Platonica*, that has been identified as his *περὶ τῶν τριῶν μονάδων*.¹⁸ Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History* 2. 18. 6 identifies six works of Philo as monobibloi: *περὶ προνοίας*, *περὶ Ἰουδαίων, πολιτικός*, *Ἀλέξανδρος* (or *περὶ τοῦ λόγον ἔχειν τὰ ἄλογα ζῶα*), *περὶ τοῦ δοῦλον εἶναι πάντα φαῦλον*, and *περὶ τοῦ πάντα σπουδαῖον ἐλεύθερον εἶναι*. The essay of Plotinus that Porphyry assembled as *Enneads* 1. 9 may be identified in Elias' commentary on Porphyry's *Isagoge* as a monobiblos *περὶ εὐλόγου ἐξαγωγῆς*;¹⁹ presumably the other fifty-three sections of the *Enneads* could also be identified the

¹⁸ Proclus, *Théologie platonicienne: Livre III*, ed. by H. D. Saffrey and L. G. Westerink (Paris 1978), "notes complémentaires" to page 43. For the "plusieurs monobibloi" of Proclus, see Damascius, *Traité des premiers principes I: De l'ineffable et de l'un*, ed. by L. G. Westerink, transl. by J. Combès (Paris 1986), "notes complémentaires" to page 86.

¹⁹ See however *Plotini Opera*, ed. by P. Henry and H.-R. Schwyzler (Paris and Brussels 1951) I 143 for the difficulty concerning the precise interpretation of Elias' reference.

same way in their original form. Michael Psellus (*De omnifaria doctrina* 115) mentions coming across three monobibloi, one each by Hippocrates, Porphyry, and Galen, on the question of whether an embryo is a living creature. Other works designated as monobibloi are grammatical. According to the scholia to line 322 of Aristophanes' *Plutus*, a certain Dionysius wrote a monobiblos on the use of χαίρειν in conversation and correspondence. Four works of Herodian are identified as monobibloi, one on ὕδωρ, one on ἦν, one περὶ κυρίων καὶ ἐπιθέτων καὶ προσηγορικῶν, and one περὶ τοῦ μὴ πάντα τὰ ῥήματα κλίνεισθαι εἰς πάντας τοὺς χρόνους. In other fields, Galen quotes from Soranus ἐν τῷ μονοβίβλῳ φαρμακευτικῷ (*Ars Medica* [above, note 17] XII 493 Kühn), and Ulpian wrote a monobiblos on the quaestorship (*Lyd. Mag.* 1. 28). According to Syrianus' commentary on the περὶ ἰδεῶν of Hermogenes, the sophist Basilicus wrote a monobiblos περὶ τόπων (57. 7). Still other monobibloi are theological in nature. Photius mentions one by Gelasius κατὰ Ἀνομοίων (cod. 102, 86a13), while the *Ecclesiastical History* of Socrates mentions one by Adrias on the life of Alexander (4. 23) and another by Athanasius on the life of the monk Antonius (1. 21). Lest anyone think that the term is never applied to a work of poetry outside Propertius, Johannes Lydus in *De magistratibus* 172. 20 quotes a dactylic hexameter from the poet Christodorus ἐν τῷ περὶ τῶν ἀκροατῶν τοῦ μεγάλου Προκλου μονοβίβλῳ. Finally, the *Glossarium ad Scriptores Mediae et Infimae Graecitatis* of Du Cange (repr. Graz 1958) s.v. μονοβίβλον contains several references which I have not succeeded in tracking down: one in the letters of Theophylact, at least three in the scholia to Basil (the entry adds "& alibi"), and a μονοβίβλον of Rufus on purgatives. In every case where verification is possible from autopsy or from another ancient source, these monobibloi are all self-contained treatises in a single book; it should be noted that in no case is "monobiblos" the title of the work, and that in no case is the monobiblos an anthology, "a separate and detached part of a collection," or an arbitrarily selected portion of an author's output. The burden of proof therefore lies with those who would assert that "monobiblos" could have a different meaning when applied to the Roman poet Propertius.²⁰

It follows that if "Book 1" was, like these works, a monobiblos, then its author could never have called it "Book 1," and it circulated by its author's choice as an autonomous work that never formed part of a larger collection. Nor was "Monobiblos" its title. Some confusion over this issue is apparent

²⁰ The only exception to monobiblos in the sense of "a work in one book" is the reference in Melito (*PG* V 1216A) and in Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History* (4. 26. 14) to a monobiblos containing the twelve prophets in a single book—a change in usage not wholly unexpected in the age of the codex, when it became possible to collect the contents of assorted rolls within a single volume. These references to monobibloi have been compiled from lexicæ and from the database of the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*; I am also much indebted in this section to my colleague John Whittaker for assistance with bibliography and for guidance regarding the works of the Aristotelian and Platonic commentators.

in Heyworth's discussion when he objects to the identification of Martial's *Monobiblos Properti* as Book 1: "Vergil had not called his *Bucolica* a *Monobiblos*, nor Horace his *Iambi*—why should the young Propertius choose such a name? Surely it is only in contrast to a series of books that the name has any sense."²¹ The point of course is that these works, like many others, were monobibloi whether or not their authors used the designation. Monobiblos was not a title, only a term of convenience used to distinguish such works from those in more than one book, like "one-reeler" in the early history of the cinema. Propertius himself seems to suggest that the title of his monobiblos was *Cynthia* (2. 24. 2 *et tua sit toto Cynthia lecta Foro*); this may be confirmed from Martial's reference to Cynthia as a *carmen* of Propertius. It follows further that, if the *Cynthia* could be identified without further qualification as "Propertius' Monobiblos," then Propertius could have written only one monobiblos, just as Ptolemy's *Apotelesmatica* could be known as his "Tetrabiblos" because he wrote only one work that comprised four books. And there is yet another logical consequence, for if Propertius wrote four books of elegies but only one monobiblos, then the remaining three books must have been published together in a three-book collection or tribiblos, since three cannot be further subdivided without creating another monobiblos.

The status of the so-called Books 2–4 as a syntagma is confirmed by two citations in ancient scholars. In the age of Nero, the poet and metrician Caesius Bassus used 2. 1. 2 as his Propertian example when demonstrating how a dactylic pentameter whose first two feet are dactyls can be turned into a choriambic by the addition of two long monosyllables; later Charisius, in noting that Propertius used the normally masculine *pulvis* as a feminine noun, cited only 2. 13. 35 in preference to the other examples at 1. 22. 6 and 4. 9. 31. Both writers bypassed examples in Book 1; this would be highly irregular if Propertius' four books were either a single tetrabiblos or four monobibloi (Bassus' Tibullan illustration of the same transformation comes from 1. 1, not 2. 1). In addition, both chose an example in Book 2 over examples in later books, precisely as they would do if they acknowledged Book 2 as the beginning of a collection which embraced Books 3 and 4 as well. Thus Martial, Bassus, and Charisius offer consistent and generally early evidence pointing to a single conclusion, that the elegies of Propertius—and it goes without saying that this must represent authorial intent—comprised two distinct works, the monobiblos which we mistakenly call Book 1, and the tribiblos comprising the equally misnamed Books 2–4. When Bassus and Charisius mined Propertius for illustrations, they followed the normal and logical practice of ancient grammarians by exploiting a longer work in preference to a shorter.²²

²¹ Heyworth, "Propertius: Division" 175.

²² For the grammarians' habits discussed in this and the next paragraph, see Skutsch 232–33.

Attempts to minimize the significance of these citations are unconvincing. Menes has argued that "there is something quirky" about Bassus' choice of examples, observing that in his discussion of the hendecasyllable "he draws on Horace *Odes* 4. 1. 1, 1. 1. 1-2, and 1. 11. 1 for his illustrations" but "would have been as well served by 1. 3. 1 instead of 4. 1. 1" (Menes 140). But this alleged "quirkiness" is in fact nothing less than an observance of the original form of the *Odes* as a tribiblos (1-3) and a separate and distinct monobiblos (4); to see Bassus respecting Horace's own original arrangement of the *Odes* enhances his credibility rather than diminishing it. When a particular example became "over-exposed" in the literature (such as 1. 1. 1 would be), grammarians sought alternatives; here Bassus took his from Horace's monobiblos of odes, in much the same way that he adduced Catullus 2. 1 in preference to the much-cited 1. 1 to illustrate a hendecasyllable with a spondaic opening. This is another of Menes' examples of alleged quirkiness, but the apparatus of Mynors' and Thomson's editions of Catullus will confirm the popularity of 1. 1; Propertius of course was not cited often enough for grammarians to be forced to resort to the *Cynthia* as an alternative to the tribiblos. As to Charisius, Menes suggests that the example of feminine *pulus* at 1. 22. 6 could have been missed because it occurs "at nearly the end of the book" (141)—as though an ancient grammarian lacked the studiousness or fortitude to research his sources thoroughly—and further suggests that the citation might be only a random choice from an intermediate source which offered a range of illustrations. Heyworth's suggestion that Caesius Bassus took his example from Book 2 rather than Book 1 because "perhaps his girlfriend had borrowed the first book of elegies" reflects an even more dismissive attitude regarding the diligence of ancient *grammatici*. But it is surely a most remarkable coincidence that two authors, of whom one could have chosen his example from Book 1, 2, or 4 and the other could have taken his from any of the four books, independently fell upon the one from Book 2: remarkable, that is, if Books 2-4 did not form a syntagma and if these scholars (or their sources, should one choose to play that game) did not follow the observed practice of ancient *grammatici*.

These conclusions about Bassus and Charisius were originally made by Birt over a hundred years ago, confirmed by Ullman at the turn of the century, and restated by Skutsch in the 1970s; but they have had little impact upon mainstream scholarship. One reason has perhaps been that those scholars used their observations to advocate Lachmann's division of Book 2 at a time when that division was largely discredited; a second is certainly the unnecessary confusion introduced by a further ancient citation. Nonius Marcellus, in citing 3. 21. 14 for the verb *secundare*, attributes it to *elegiarum libro III*^o. Birt assumed that the *libri elegiarum* implied by Nonius' method of citation were identical to the syntagma from which Bassus and Charisius must have cited; he then argued that this syntagma must have consisted originally of four books rather than three if 3. 21

appeared in its third book, and contended further that this confirmed Lachmann's hypothesis that Book 2 combines the remains of two originally separate books. But his arguments rest upon a false assumption. *Libri elegiarum* is neither a title, like *Cynthia* or *Amores*, nor a term of the booktrade, like monobiblos; it is simply a generic description of the kind of poetry Propertius wrote, and there is certainly no reason to suppose that *libri elegiarum* could designate a syntagma in opposition to a monobiblos which is itself a *liber elegiarum* (it is also worth observing that *elegiarum* in Nonius is unnecessary—and therefore suspect—since Propertius wrote nothing except elegies). Rather than by arguing that the number "III" in Nonius is corrupt,²³ the discrepancy between Martial, Bassus, and Charisius on the one hand and Nonius on the other can best be explained by supposing that Nonius reflects a later stage in the transmission,²⁴ where the originally separate status of the two collections had been obscured in the transition from rolls to codex format; while Martial and Bassus and Charisius (or his source) knew the *Cynthia* as a monobiblos occupying its own roll and the *Amores* as a tribiblos on three more rolls, Nonius (or his source) consulted a codex which combined the two works as four *libri elegiarum*. A similar fate certainly befell Horace's *Odes* at an uncertain date,²⁵ and how such a format might influence the way in which originally separate works were perceived can be illustrated from the manuscript tradition of Seneca's *Dialogues*. Bibl. Ambrosiana C 90 inf., a late eleventh-century Beneventan copy, begins with an index of contents which L. D. Reynolds in the introduction to his Oxford Classical Text suggests was copied from an ancient exemplar. There the contents are listed as "Dialogorum Libri Num .XII.," or "Twelve Books of Dialogues." This of course is not "a dodecabiblos of dialogues" but "dialogues comprising twelve books in all"; moreover, these twelve books represent only ten separate works, the discrepancy being due to the fact that nine of the dialogues are monobibloi while one (*De Ira*) is a tribiblos, thus making a total of twelve original rolls or "books." If we imagine an ancient codex of Propertius with a similar index under a heading such as "Elegiarum Libri Num .IV." it becomes easy to see how Nonius (or a source) might have been led to regard the *Cynthia* and the three-book syntagma as four undifferentiated books of elegies.

²³ For considerations of the number's reliability, see Ullman 46; Skutsch 231; Menes 142–43; Goold 18; Heyworth, "Propertius: Division" 178–81.

²⁴ Note that the evidence of Martial and Bassus takes us within a century or so of Propertius' lifetime and thus is a priori more likely to reflect his original intention than later custom.

²⁵ It may be worth noting that Nonius (203. 29 M) cites Horace, *Carm.* 4. 14. 27 as coming from "Carminum lib. IV"; Priscian, Eutyches, and Marius Victorinus also assign lines from that book to the fourth book of *carmina*. Marius further exemplifies the agglutinative process suggested here for Propertius by referring to the *Epodes* as Book 5 of the *Odes* (GL VI 169 Keil *Libro V, qui epodon inscribitur*).

More boldly, and more speculatively, one might suggest that *elegiarum libro III^o* in the manuscripts of Nonius is nothing less than a corruption of the reference that we would expect in contrast with Martial's monobiblos: [*elegiarum*] *tribiblo*. This could well have been abbreviated [*elegiarum*] *IIIBiblo*, which requires little more than the easy substitution or corruption of Latin *libro* for *biblo* and a change of word order to become what we find in Nonius.

It remains to deal with the arguments advanced in favour of dividing Book 2. Lachmann's own suggestions do not survive examination. Two pieces of evidence are supposed to show that lines have been lost from our text. The first comprises Fulgentius' two alleged citations of Propertius, *catillata geris uadimonia*, *publicum prostibulum* and *diuidias mentis conficit omnis amor*; the fact that the former of these is manifestly false casts suspicion upon the latter as well. The second is Ovid, *Tristia* 2. 465, *inuenies eadem blandi praecepta Properti*. Our text of course contains no instructions of the sort implied, but Ovid's statement, like much of *Tristia* 2, can be dismissed as special pleading which ruthlessly distorts the work of a safely dead author. Nor could 2. 10 make a very satisfactory introduction to a book of poetry dedicated to Augustus, since only a little way into it Propertius is already backing off and protesting his incapacity to write what he has just promised (2. 10. 21 ff., cited below). Finally, the argument from 2. 13. 25–26 entails two difficulties. First, the elegy containing these lines refers not to the present but to the future (2. 13. 17 *quandocumque igitur nostros mors claudet ocellos*), and so they describe not what Propertius has written so far but what he would like to have written before he dies; hence they may appropriately appear in the first book of the tribiblos as an "announcement" of its eventual dimensions. Second, the tendency to think of Propertius' cortege as factual rather than hypothetical has been abetted by an incorrect restoration of 25. The archetype gave this line in the corrupt form (accepted nonetheless by Hanslik) *sat mea sit magna si tres sint pompa libelli*. The generally accepted emendation *sat mea sat magna est si tres sint pompa libelli* can hardly be right; the single indicative form *est* (which it must be remembered is a conjectural emendation in any case) has no place among the subjunctives which Propertius consistently uses here to convey his instructions (19 *spatietur*, 20 *sit*, 21 *sternatur*, 22 *sit*, 23 *desit* . . . *adsint*): Only with the instructions to Cynthia in 27–30 does he change tense and mood (to future indicative, not present) before returning again to the subjunctive.²⁶ Given then that the transmitted *sit* seems secure, the likeliest restoration is perhaps *sat sit magna, mihi si tres sint pompa libelli*.²⁷ Goold adds that Book 2 is significantly longer than any other

²⁶ Heyworth, "Propertius: Division" 165 n. 1 observes: "For indicative in apodosis, subjunctive in epistasis, cf. 2. 5. 16"; but the issue is not whether this combination is possible but whether *est* ought to be "restored" in the first place.

²⁷ The conjecture seems to originate with Franciscus Maturantius, scholar-scribe of Rome, Bibl. Casanatense 3227.

Augustan poetry book and that "the fragmentary nature of much of its contents obliges us to postulate a considerable amount lost in lacunae, so that in its original form this section of the poet's work must have filled on a conservative estimate over 1500 lines" (Goold 16). An alternative explanation which accounts for both the inordinate length and the "fragmentary" state of the text is to suppose that Book 2 has been disturbed by interpolations rather than by lacunae.

No theory about the publication of Propertius' elegies can be entirely free of uncertainty, but the one offered here satisfies more of the evidence than any other, with little or no special pleading: It respects the testimony of Martial and the overwhelmingly predominant meaning of "monobiblos"; it respects the logical deduction that Propertius could have written only one monobiblos; it respects the important and early testimony of Caesius Bassus and its confirmation from Charisius; it respects the manuscripts' division of the corpus into four books rather than five; and it also accommodates rationally the evidence of Nonius Marcellus.²⁸ It has as well the further advantage of being supported by internal evidence of unity and design.

II

Certain postulates are fundamental to the following discussion of unity in the tribiblos. First, Propertius' elegies are not discrete entities but are meant to be read together in a linear progression for cumulative meaning; each elegy, each book in fact, is only one element of the tribiblos and achieves its full significance only when read in sequence together with all the other elements. Of course such a linear reading is virtually demanded by the format of the ancient bookroll, which offered little scope for browsing back and forth. Moreover, Propertius' *Cynthia* already reveals a sophisticated appreciation of how juxtaposition and cross-reference can establish connections among poems and thereby enhance meaning in a linear reading. The Ponticus elegies, 7 and 9, are a case in point. In the former Propertius predicts that Ponticus will one day fall in love, in the latter the prediction has become fact; we have no foreknowledge of 9 when we read 7, but we are certainly meant to recall 7 when we read 9. (The Gallus elegies, 10 and 13, have a similar relationship.) Propertius' technique is analogous to that of the collage, where elements assembled from different sources illustrate a

²⁸ Contrast the conclusion offered by Heyworth, "Propertius: Division" 181: "My interpretation of the evidence is then as follows: the five books of Propertius circulated together in antiquity; by chance Book I is never cited by later writers; Nonius in citing 3. 21. 14 attributed it to *elegiarum liber IIII*; this reading was copied from the archetype by the scribe of L but corrupted to *III* in the other branch and subsequently in L." This interpretation requires accepting an unattested meaning of monobiblos; assumes error in the book-division of the Propertian tradition; assumes error in the transmission of Nonius; assumes that Caesius Bassus just happened to miss the *Cynthia*; and assumes that Charisius just happened to do the same, thus dismissing four of the five principal pieces of evidence as either error or coincidence.

single theme from different perspectives, but it is more structured, at least linearly, in that his collage is meant to be "read" in only one direction. There is no narrative thread as such, and no "message" or "meaning" is spelled out explicitly; rather the reader is left to extract the cumulative meaning from the multiple resonances created by sequence, juxtaposition, echoing, or cross-reference within the whole.²⁹ Second, a self-conscious poet, when he discusses his craft, deserves a serious and respectful hearing. It has become fashionable to view Propertius' programmatic elegies as variations of the so-called *recusatio*, a literary category with no basis in ancient theory,³⁰ to reduce all of them to the expression of essentially a single sentiment (Propertius' refusal to produce poetry for the new regime), and even to regard them as politically motivated evasions rather than expressions of a literary programme;³¹ a second kind of homogenization has occurred in the synthetic analyses of these programmatic elegies that fail to consider their position or sequence.³² A novelty of this paper is that it will—for the first time, it seems—offer a reading of these elegies (chiefly 2.

²⁹ I fully endorse the views set forth at Hutchinson 99–106 (for example, "Meaning . . . is not always confined within the individual poem; a part of the poet's meaning can be contained in the relations between the poems in a book"), but I extend the principle to the three-book collection as a whole, which constitutes a continuous discourse where no single element possesses its full meaning without reference to the others. See also Hutchinson 99–100 for further examples of Propertian elegies which presuppose awareness of other elegies in a collection, and for more on 1. 7–9 within the sequence constituted by 1. 6–14, see J. L. Butrica, "Two Two-Part Poems in Propertius Book 1 (1. 8; 1. 11 and 12)," *PLS* 9 (1996) 83–91.

³⁰ For Propertius and the *recusatio*, see now A. Cameron, *Callimachus and his Critics* (Princeton 1995) 472–75. Rather than as variations of a literary "form," the passages where Propertius and other Augustan poets express similar choices in formally similar terms (Virgil in *Ecl.* 6, Horace in *Carm.* 4. 15, for example) should be regarded as independent (but sometimes interrelated) imitations of the prologue to the *Aetia*, where Callimachus proclaimed his choice of poetic style and content. The already ill-defined concept of *recusatio* has been twisted and stretched in recent scholarship almost to the point of meaninglessness, so that poems like 2. 1, where Propertius says that he would write a kind of epic if he could, and 4. 1, in which epic is not at issue, have been called *recusationes*; even a whole book has been so designated (see Sullivan [above, note 7] 138–39 for Book 4 as "Propertius' ultimate *recusatio*").

³¹ For example, Lyne 148 asserts that for Propertius Callimacheanism is only a "graceful, witty, civilized means of saying no." The Callimachean model involved an aesthetic rather than a political choice, and the same is true of Propertian programmatic elegies as well; but the political interpretation has been imposed by scholars who cannot accept that a currently fashionable poet like Propertius could have been anything but hostile to the currently unfashionable imperialist despot Augustus. The entire book devoted to this kind of political interpretation (H.-P. Stahl, *Propertius: Love and War: Individual and State Under Augustus* [Berkeley 1985]) illustrates passim how such an approach leads to distorted interpretations. The "unfulfilled" promises of 2. 10, for example, appear much less sinister when in the context of the entire tribbles it becomes clear that they are in fact fulfilled by poems like 3. 11 and 4. 6 and others. In any case, it would seem the purest self-destructive folly for Propertius always to be advertising his opposition in this way if the political climate was as oppressive as Stahl assumes; it is also difficult to believe that Propertius was under constant danger when Ovid managed to publish the more risqué *Amores* not once but twice, and was punished only a decade after the later and even more risqué *Ars Amatoria*.

³² For some synthetic interpretations of this kind, see Chapter 8 of G. Luck, *The Latin Love Elegy* (London 1959); G. Lieberg, "Die Muse des Properz und seine Dichterweihe," *Philologus* 107 (1963) 116–29, 263–70; and Wimmel passim.

1, 2. 10, 3. 1–3, 3. 9, and 4. 1) that respects both their literal meaning and their chronology, arguing that they yield a coherent depiction of the evolution of a poetic *persona*.³³ It is accordingly assumed that protestations of inadequacy for the grand style can also be regarded seriously and literally rather than as further politically motivated evasions. In most branches of art criticism (except the study of Latin poetry, it seems) it is recognized that large-scale and small-scale forms do indeed require different talents and that artists who excel in both are the exception rather than the rule: Schubert writing *The Ring of the Niebelung* is as inconceivable as Wagner writing *The Trout*, and for neither was the nature of his talent a political choice. An elegist's reluctance to attempt epic need not mask political opposition.³⁴

The structure of the tribiblos can be illustrated more economically than its meaning. Of course the most obvious structural element is the division into three books, to which Propertius himself surely alluded when he wrote about the *tres libelli* that he would like to take with him to Hades. To reinforce this symmetry he begins each book with an extended and explicit programmatic elegy of a kind unknown to the *Cynthia*; all of these elegies concern the same issues, namely the nature of Propertius' talent and the direction of his poetry, and do so in the same terms, with Roman epic and learned Hellenistic elegy being cast consistently as the alternatives to love elegy. There is a less obvious division of the tribiblos into halves. It has long been an object of curiosity that Maecenas, if he was Propertius' patron, should be addressed only twice in the entire corpus, in the prominent 2. 1 and in the somewhat out-of-the-way 3. 9.³⁵ The reason seems to be that, while 2. 1 begins the tribiblos and dedicates it to Maecenas, 3. 9 marks the beginning of its second half (as well as an important stage in the development of Propertius' *persona*; see below). In the text as transmitted, the lines from 2. 1. 1 to the end of 3. 8 total 1,690, while those from 3. 9. 1 to the end of 4. 11 total 1,602—a difference of only 88 lines (the blocks may originally have been even more closely matched in length, given the number of lacunae and interpolated lines that undoubtedly figure in our text, especially in Book 2). A third structural element consists of two parallel series of related poems dealing with attempted rejections of Cynthia and their consequences, the first in the early part of Book 2 (2. 10–14), the second extending from the end of Book 3 through most of Book 4; as will

³³ Something comparable, though in less depth and finding less coherence, was attempted by G. D'Anna, "L'evoluzione della poetica properziana," in *Bimillenario della morte di Propertio: Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi Properziani* (Rome and Assisi 1985) 53–74.

³⁴ The political interpretation of 2. 1, for example, has been bolstered by claims that Propertius deliberately shows himself a competent epic poet even as he denies the capacity. Gold, *Literary Patronage* 159 speaks of the catalogue in 2. 1. 27–34 as "an attempt to write epic" and "an example of a mini-epic"; Stahl too (above, note 31) claims that 27–34 demonstrate Propertius' proficiency in epic, but the problems of structure, action, and characterization in epic are worlds apart from the composition of an 8-line catalogue.

³⁵ Gold, "Propertius 3. 9" 103, for example, describes the elegy as "an anomaly, a program poem which does not start off the book."

be shown later, the first attempt fails quickly, while the second finds a partial success at the poetic, though not at the erotic, level.

If Propertius the consummate obsessed lover is the obvious unifying element of the *Cynthia*, the chief unifying element of the tribiblos is Propertius the poet, for his self-definition as poet and the conflicting claims of three kinds of poetry—love elegy for Cynthia, Ennian historical epic for Augustus, and imitation of learned Hellenistic elegy—dominate and articulate the structure of the collection. It must be emphasized, however, that here, no less than in the *Cynthia*, Propertius' self-representation is precisely that: the creation of a *persona* that might or might not coincide with his actual development as a poet. A linear reading of the programmatic elegies in the tribiblos has much to contribute to our understanding of Propertius and his relationship to Callimachus. The famous self-identification as *Callimachus Romanus* (4. 1. 64), which has so often been taken out of context and assumed to have general validity, has contributed to the mistaken belief that everything in Propertius is Callimachean, even the Cynthia-poetry;³⁶ but the literal, consecutive, non-homogenized approach taken here suggests what will seem to some the heretical conclusion that Propertius presents himself as a Callimachean poet in the strictest sense—that is to say, as someone who produced self-conscious imitations of specific works by Callimachus—only in the final book and even there only tentatively,³⁷ and that for Propertius Callimachean elegy is almost as antithetical to love elegy as Ennian epic (the qualification “almost” being necessary only because Callimachean elegy, unlike epic, is at least in the same metre as the Cynthia-poetry). Because the issue of Propertius' Callimacheanism is so important to the following discussion, and because the perception that he was a “Callimachean poet” throughout

³⁶ Wyke, for example, says that “Cynthia and Callimachus are inseparable” (49) and that “the text even encourages the reader to interpret the title ‘Cynthia’ as a key Callimachean term in the Propertian poetics” (59), and represents Callimacheanism as a political choice: “Poems 2. 10–13 thus form a group which re-establishes an allegiance to a politically unorthodox, Callimachean poetic practice” (60). She was certainly influenced by the claim of W. Clausen, to be discussed below, that the adjective *Cynthius* constitutes a reference to Callimachus. Ross too takes it as given that the Cynthia-poetry is Callimachean (for example, “it is his love poetry that makes him a Callimachean” [115]—even though Callimachus never wrote anything resembling the love poetry of Propertius), and this perhaps distorts his account of Propertius' development even more than his insistence upon interpreting it in the light of a highly implausible reconstruction of Gallus' lost poetry. For Lyne, Propertius in Book 3 “elaborates his claim to Callimachean pedigree with great detail and (I think) humorous speciousness . . . ; what he does is, in effect, equate Callimacheanism with his own sort of love poetry” (136). The notion of Propertius the Callimachean is so ingrained that a study of the hexameters of Propertius and Callimachus—which (ironically enough) finds essentially no Callimachean influence—nonetheless speaks of “il callimachismo di Propertio, da interpretare certamente come scelta di vita oltre che di poesia” (V. Viparelli Santangelo, *L'esametro di Propertio: Rapporti con Callimaco* [Naples 1986] 8).

³⁷ Hubbard 70–71 is an outstanding exception among recent scholars in suggesting a point close to the one made here: “It is only in Book III . . . that he asks for initiation into Callimachus' rites, only in Book IV that he hopes his Umbria will be known as the home of the Roman Callimachus.”

his career is so deeply entrenched, an excursus on the Callimacheanism of Book 1 seems appropriate.

That Propertius' entire *Cynthia* is a book of Callimachean poetry has frequently been asserted or assumed but never demonstrated in detail. Many considerations make the claim inherently unlikely. For example, the only poet singled out for admiration here is Mimnermus (1. 9. 11); even leaving aside the question of whether any of Mimnermus' poetry was criticized in the prologue of the *Aetia*, this seems odd for a book of supposedly Callimachean poetry, especially since in Books 2–4 Propertius repeatedly names Callimachus as an actual or potential model. (The attention to Propertius as a Callimachean poet has also obscured the fact, to be discussed in more detail later, that Propertius nearly always names Philitas together with Callimachus in these passages; the fact that so much more of Callimachus survives than of Philitas has probably abetted significantly the perception that Propertius is Callimachean rather than Philitean.) Moreover, Books 2–4 contain a number of prominently placed programmatic elegies; yet Book 1 not only contains no such programmatic elegy, it features a close imitation of Meleager in the position most favoured for such elegies in Books 2–4 (see below). In addition, as will be argued in more detail later in the discussion of 3. 1, it is only at the beginning of Book 3 that Propertius begins to talk, not about *being* a Callimachean poet, but about *becoming* one. Finally, it is only at the beginning of Book 4 that Propertius claims the title of *Callimachus Romanus*.

The view that Propertius was already a Callimachean poet in his first published work seems to rest upon three props. The first is an inappropriate retrojection of that title *Callimachus Romanus* advanced in 4. 1. 64. But this title is not meant to have universal validity, and is claimed only in the context of composing the Roman *Aetia* proposed in the same passage: Propertius requests the aid of Bacchus in his endeavour *so that* Umbria, as birthplace of the Roman Callimachus, may swell with pride in his work (*mī folia ex hedera porrige, Bacche, tua, / ut nostris tumefacta superbiat Vmbria libris, / Vmbria Romani patria Callimachi* 4. 1. 62–64).

The second is the conviction that the very name "Cynthia" constitutes a Callimachean allusion. This is based upon the claim made by Wendell Clausen in "CYNTHIUS" (*AJP* 97 [1976] 245–47) that Κύνθιος as an epithet of Apollo is distinctly and uniquely Callimachean. Clausen noted that the epithet was used earlier, in periphrastic expressions designating Mt. Cynthus, in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* (17), in Aristophanes (*Nu.* 596), in Euripides (*IT* 1098), and in *AP* 15. 25. 12 (he might also have mentioned Pindar, *Paean* 12. 8 and Lycophron 574), but he asserted that its application to Apollo himself was unique to Callimachus and indeed was his "invention." The very next year, however, Clausen published his overlooked correction, "CYNTHIUS: An Addendum" (*AJP* 98 [1977] 362), in which he reported that J. E. G. Zetzel had informed him that Apollo is

addressed as Κύνθιε in a fragment of Posidippus (= *Supplementum Hellenisticum* 705. 9). Forced by this to admit that the epithet is clearly not "exclusively Callimachean," even in reference to Apollo, and to acknowledge that priority can not be established securely ("the chronological relationship between the two poets [*sc.* Callimachus and Posidippus] cannot be exactly determined"), Clausen nevertheless continued to maintain that the epithet was originally Callimachean, on the grounds that Virgil regarded it as Callimachean (by which he presumably means that Virgil employed it in contexts that contain imitations of Callimachus) and "may not have known Posidippus' poem." The unbiased observer will see that his reasons for insisting upon Callimachus' priority represent nothing more than wishful thinking, supported by what amounts to a mind-reading act which purports to describe the emotions of Horace and Callimachus (e.g., "it is tempting to imagine Callimachus reading this line [*sc.* the one in which Posidippus used Κύνθιε] with emotions not unlike those of Horace when he read Propertius 3. 2. 19 ff."). There seems to be little reason to doubt that Virgil found the title in Callimachus, that he was the first Roman poet to use it, and that subsequent occurrences in Horace, Ovid, and "Lygdamus" can be attributed to his influence; but the evidence for making it a Callimachean "invention" at all, much less something distinctively Callimachean that screams "Callimachus" wherever it is used, is tenuous indeed. In fact, Mt. Cynthus is so well attested as the birthplace of Apollo, and the epithet is so well attested in reference to that mountain, that it seems improbable that Greek literature had to wait so many centuries for a poet to transfer the epithet to the god himself; it is worth noting that in one Pindaric occurrence of the epithet (fr. 60b Snell, col. 2. 14; again in the *Paeans*, and again missed by Clausen) the noun modified by the epithet has been lost, leaving open the possibility that Callimachus and Posidippus depend upon Pindar. Another issue that must be addressed is the relation that is supposed to exist between *Cynthius* as a distinctly Callimachean epithet of Apollo and *Cynthia* as the name of Propertius' *domina* or as the name of his monobiblos. For any connection to exist, we must assume that Propertius intended *Cynthia* as a feminine form derived from *Cynthius* and thus meaning "Apolline." But Apollo had a sister who shared his birthplace and who is therefore frequently called *Cynthia* in Latin poetry: How does the reader of Propertius know that Cynthia is not a divine name alluding to Artemis/Diana but the feminine form of Apollo's "distinctively Callimachean" epithet? In fact the parallel case of *Cynthia* as epithet of Artemis/Diana helps to illuminate the case of *Cynthius* as epithet of Apollo. The former is never attested in Greek literature, much as the latter is attested there only in Callimachus and Posidippus; but both are relatively common in Latin poetry. If we interpret the evidence for *Cynthia* as rigidly as Clausen interpreted the evidence for *Cynthius* when he argued that its application to Apollo originates with Callimachus (leaving aside for the moment the possibility that Posidippus used it first) because there are no

earlier occurrences in Greek poetry, we will have to suppose that *Cynthia* is an invention of Horace, who is apparently the first Latin poet to use it. But the inherent absurdity of this should be apparent; it is far more likely that we have simply lost the Greek contexts in which Artemis was called *Cynthia*, just as we have lost most of the Greek contexts in which Apollo was called *Cynthius*. An even more instructive parallel is the case of *Daulias* (as in *Daulias auis*, meaning the nightingale), recently discussed by Gianpiero Rosati at *CQ* 46 (1996) 214–15, with notes 36 and 39. As Rosati observes, the epithet is not found in extant Greek poetry but does appear with a certain frequency in Latin poetry, first at Catullus 65. 14, then (rather curiously) in a series of texts whose authorship is disputed: *Ciris* 200, *Epicedion Drusi* 106, [Ovid] *Epistulae Heroidum* 15. 154, [Seneca] *Hercules Oetaeus* 192. Pfeiffer, somewhat diffidently (“*ludere possis*” is how he put it), suggested restoring it in Callimachus fr. 113. 2 (δαυ[λιάδες]). If it were attested securely in Callimachus, no doubt it would be identified as a Callimachean coinage, with consequences for the interpretation of the works that contain it; except that, as Rosati points out, we have the explicit testimony of Thucydides that the epithet was widely used in Greek poetry (2. 29. 3 πολλοῖς δὲ καὶ τῶν ποιητῶν ἐν ἀηδόνοσ μνήμῃ Δαυλιάς ἢ ὄρνις ἐπωνόμασται) to show that we have simply lost all of those early occurrences.

The third, and perhaps most influential, prop has been the conviction that 1. 18 contains significant reminiscences of the Acontius and Cydippe episode of the *Aetia*, as argued by Francis Cairns.³⁸ Cairns began by repeating the observation, already anticipated by others, that Propertius 1. 18. 21–22 (*a quotiens teneras resonant mea uerba sub umbras / scribitur et uestris Cynthia corticibus!*) “resembles” fr. 73 Pfeiffer of the *Aetia*, which self-evidently comes from the Acontius and Cydippe episode (ἀλλ’ ἐνὶ δὴ φλοιοῖσι [Bentley: φύλλοισι codd.] κεκομμένα τόσσα φέροιτε / γράμματα, Κυδίππην ὅσ’ ἐρέουσι καλὴν). It will be noted that there are no close parallels in expression (Propertius states a fact, Acontius a wish) or in diction (*scribitur* can hardly be regarded as an echo or imitation of γράμματα). The sole resemblance resides in the conceit of a lover writing the name of his beloved in the bark of a tree—something that young men and women have done for ages without necessarily having read Callimachus; indeed, the scholiast to Aristophanes, *Acharnians* 144 who has preserved the couplet remarked that writing the names of beloveds on walls or trees or “leaves” (his text of the fragment of course read φύλλοισι) was ἴδιον ἐραστῶν. Cairns went on to cite other “verbal echoes” in addition to this one, all, it should be added, from the paraphrase contained at Aristaenetus, *Epistles* 1. 10 rather than from any of the other 106 lines from the episode (excluding fr. 73) printed by Pfeiffer. (This of course raises the complication that the resemblances could in fact be between

³⁸ “Propertius i. 18 and Callimachus, *Acontius and Cydippe*,” *CR* 20 (1969) 131–34.

Propertius and Aristaenetus, not Callimachus.) The first contains two parts, (a) and (b). Of these (a) is the stronger, probably the strongest of all, the resemblance between the fanciful question that Acontius asks about the lovelife of trees (ἄρα κὰν ὑμῖν ἐστὶν οὗτος ὁ ἔρωσ καὶ πίτυος τυχὸν ἡράσθη κυπάριτος) and Propertius' speculation *si quos habet arbor amores / fagus et . . . pinus* (1. 18. 19–20); (b) amounts only to a shared mention of beeches. Cairns' second echo consists of the epithets ἡδύφωνος and *argutus* applied to birds; while both refer to sounds, they emphasize different qualities, "sweetness" in the Greek, "clarity" in the Latin. The third echo consists of a fanciful wish in Aristaenetus ("would that you trees had mind and voice so that you might say 'Cydippe is fair'") set against Propertius 1. 18. 31, a more realistic wish that the forests might echo his own cries of "Cynthia." Moreover, it can be argued that this is only the same resemblance between fr. 73 and Propertius 1. 18. 21–22 with which Cairns began, since the passage of Aristaenetus invoked is none other than his paraphrase of fr. 73 itself. In fact the words that in Aristaenetus follow those quoted by Cairns (ἢ γοῦν τσσαῦτα κατὰ τῶν φλοιῶν ἐγκεκολαμμένα φέροιτε γράμματα) were used by Pierson to confirm Bentley's correction of φύλλοισι in that fragment to φλοιοῖσι, as printed above. The fourth echo involves the description of Acontius as μαραινόμενος τὴν χροιάν, set against Propertius 1. 18. 18 *an quia parua damus mutato signa colore?*; but the pallor of lovers is another well-established conceit of ancient erotic literature. The fifth echo involves a passage in which Aristaenetus says of Acontius: "The nights brought only tears, not sleep, to the youth. Being ashamed to weep by day, he husbanded his tears for the nights . . . He was afraid to show himself to his sire, and used to go into the countryside on any excuse, shunning his father." Propertius 1. 18. 1–6 says nothing about weeping by night or about deliberately avoiding a father (or anyone else, for that matter) and speaks only of pouring forth grief in a quiet and uninhabited place; Aristaenetus, on the other hand, does not associate Acontius' weeping with the countryside, and sends him there only to avoid his father. Both men wept, and both spent some time in the country, but only Propertius wept in the country.

Such is the evidence on which the case for Propertius' imitation of the Acontius and Cydippe episode has been based. Cairns himself conceded (133): "It might be argued that most of the correspondences claimed are *loci communes* and hence coincidental. They are indeed commonplaces." With this I heartily concur. But he went on to argue that "the sheer number of correspondences of situation and detail appears to me to be too great to be accidental." I would counter that they are by no means as numerous or as compelling as Cairns suggests. But a further point must be made. Even when one grants that Propertius did have a direct acquaintance with the *Aetia* in general and with this episode in particular (and the fame of the poem, of the author, and of the episode would make it hardly possible for him not to), and even if Propertius did, as Cairns argued, model his personal

situation in this elegy after the situation of the love-sick Acontius, this does not make him a "Callimachean" poet any more than writing *Ulysses* makes Tennyson a Homeric poet. To be a Callimachean poet he must write in a Callimachean style or in Callimachean forms or profess Callimachean ideals in Callimachean imagery; he does none of these in Book 1, and does them only later, when he is explicitly professing to follow Callimachus.

It is instructive to compare the degree of resemblance that Cairns has claimed between Propertius 1. 18 and the Acontius and Cydippe episode with the degree of resemblance between Propertius 1. 1. 1-4 and the first four lines of an epigram of Meleager preserved as AP 12. 101:

τόν με Πόθοις ἄτρωτον ὑπὸ στέρνοισι Μυίσκος
 ὄμμασι τοξεύσας τοῦτ' ἐβόησεν ἔπος·
 "τὸν θρασὺν εἶλον ἐγὼ· τὸ δ' ἐπ' ὄφρυσιν κείνο φρύαγμα
 σκηπτροφόρου σοφίας ἦνίδε ποσσὶ πατῶ."

The Propertian lines, with echoes of Meleager italicized, are:

Cynthia prima suis miserum me cepit ocellis
contactum nullis ante Cupidinibus;
 tum mihi *constantis* deiecit *lumina fastus*
 et caput impositis *pressit Amor pedibus*.

Here the correspondences are numerous, detailed, and precise. In Propertius 1. 1. 1-2 *Cynthia . . . me . . . ocellis* answers exactly to με . . . Μυίσκος . . . ὄμμασι, while *cepit* reflects εἶλον. Propertius' *contactum nullis . . . Cupidinibus* comes from Πόθοις ἄτρωτον. The third-person depiction of Cupid in 3-4 is based upon the first-person claims of Myiscus, with *constantis . . . lumina fastus* coming from φρύαγμα σκηπτροφόρου σοφίας and *pressit . . . pedibus* from ποσσὶ πατῶ. Apparently there is a good deal more of Meleager here than there is of Callimachus in 1. 18.

But the question of defining the Propertius of Book 1 as a Callimachean poet is really only a matter of degree. If we wish to call him a Callimachean poet because certain commonplaces shared between 1. 18 and an episode of the *Aetia* might show direct acquaintance with that poem, we may do so, as long as we also call him a Meleagrian poet because of his imitation of AP 12. 101 and, for that matter, a Theocritean poet because of his imitation of *Idyll* 13 in the Hylas elegy. He was a Callimachean poet in the same sense in which virtually everyone else of that era was as well, for a similar or even greater degree of "Callimachean influence" can also be traced in Catullus, in Tibullus, in Virgil, and in Horace; this would be better defined as a pervasive Alexandrianism than as a specifically and self-consciously Callimachean presence.³⁹ If, however, we wish to call

³⁹ Note the conclusion reached by G. Pascucci, "Il Callimachismo stilistico di Propertio," in *Bimillenario* (above, note 33) 199-222, that "è riduttivo considerare Callimaco il modello stilistico di Propertio; ce ne sono altri, da individuare nell'area della poesia alessandrina e

Propertius a Callimachean poet in the sense that his work here is exclusively, or even only primarily, Callimachean in inspiration, we need more than a handful of shared commonplaces, and we need to address the difficulties raised earlier, such as why someone who is allegedly a self-consciously Callimachean poet in his earliest work must in his later work ask Callimachus himself how to become one. One would in fact be hard pressed to demonstrate any sustained emulation of Callimachus here.⁴⁰ The style is not Callimachean, but strongly influenced by Catullus (and, one suspects, other elegiac predecessors like Varro, Calvus, and Gallus); it is only later, when he is speaking explicitly of imitating Callimachus, that Propertius begins to evolve toward a kind of Callimachean intellectual abstraction in his expression. One would be equally hard pressed to detect imitation of Callimachean forms in the *Cynthia*. Virgil imitated Theocritus in the context of pastoral poetry, Hesiod and Aratus in the context of didactic, Homer in the context of epic; yet Propertius here writes elegies of a kind not written by Callimachus, and does not write epigrams, the only kind of personal erotic poetry that Callimachus did essay. It is only when Propertius is explicitly imitating the *Aetia* in Book 4 that he composes elegies that approximate to episodes of that poem (or indeed to anything else that Callimachus wrote). Virgil's imitations of Theocritus and Hesiod also contain significant and obvious imitations of Callimachus in programmatic contexts, in *Eclogues* 6 and *Georgics* 3 respectively. Whether these indicate that his poems are actually intended to be Callimachean rather than or as well as Theocritean and Hesiodic is open to question; but again Propertius restricts his obvious imitations of Callimachean programmatic statements to the phase of his work which is expressly Callimachean, and none are found in the *Cynthia*.

We may now return to Books 2–4. The artistic development depicted here in the tribiblos can be described roughly as comprising three stages: In Book 2 Propertius is a poet of raw talent inspired solely by his love of Cynthia, in Book 3 he aspires to become instead an imitator of Hellenistic Greek elegy, and in Book 4 he tries to realize these aspirations while resisting Cynthia's persistent influence. His self-definition as poet takes centre stage in the programmatic elegies that stand at the beginning of each book, at the end of Book 2, and at 3. 9, where the second half of the tribiblos begins. The first of these is 2. 1, which introduces all the major literary and erotic themes of the collection; naturally one looks to the opening lines for a significant statement (2. 1. 1–16):

quaeritis unde mihi totiens scribantur Amores,
unde meus ueniat mollis in ora liber?

segnatamente nella poesia epigrammatica"; see also G. Giangrande, "Propertius: Callimachus Romanus?" in *Atti del Colloquium Propertianum (Secundum)* (Assisi 1981) 147–67.

⁴⁰ I fully endorse the view of G. D'Anna (above, note 33) that "la poetica della Monobilos [sic] non appare dunque callimachea" (56).

non haec Calliope, non haec mihi cantat Apollo:
 ingenium nobis ipsa puella facit.
 siue illam Cois fulgentem incedere †cogis †, 5
 hac⁴¹ totum e Coa ueste uolumen erit:
 seu uidi ad frontem sparsos errare capillos,
 gaudet laudatis ire superba comis:
 siue lyrae carmen digitis percussit eburnis,
 miramur facilis ut premat arte manus: 10
 seu compescentes⁴² somnum declinat ocellos,
 inuenio causas mille poeta nouas:
 seu nuda erepto mecum luctatur amictu,
 tum uero longas condimus Iliadas.
 [seu quicquid fecit siue est quodcumque locuta, 15
 maxima de nihilo nascitur historia.]⁴³

Propertius begins with an imaginary question from his readers: How does he come always to be writing *amores*? The presence of this word here, ending the first line much as *Cynthia* began the first line of the monobiblos, is of course the best evidence for proposing *Amores* as the title of the tribiblos; indeed both Jacoby and Giardina have already suggested, with greater and lesser certainty respectively, that *amores* serves here as a title.⁴⁴ To this supposed query Propertius replies that his poetry comes not from conventional sources of inspiration like Apollo and Calliope but from Cynthia herself and her appearance and behaviour.⁴⁵ This bold programmatic statement should be treated with the respect its prominent position demands, and without preconceptions derived from our knowledge that Propertius will go on to invoke the shade of Callimachus and eventually lay claim to the title *Callimachus Romanus*. First of all, the opposition between Cynthia on the one hand and Apollo and Calliope on the other as figures of inspiration is structurally important for the entire tribiblos, and especially for the conflict between Cynthia-poetry and the other kinds of poetry which Propertius aspires to write. Second, Propertius is emphatically not a Callimachean poet here; he explicitly denies the involvement of Apollo, who dictated Callimachus' stylistic preoccupations in the *Aetia* prologue, and of Calliope, who served as informant in the same

⁴¹ The correction of Barth and Kuinoel for the transmitted *hoc*.

⁴² Leo's correction of the manuscripts' *cum poscentes*.

⁴³ This clumsy and prosaic summary of the previous lines should be ejected from the text as an interpolation (according to Smyth's *Thesaurus criticus ad Sexti Properti textum*, Heydenreich reported that they were deleted by Gruppe).

⁴⁴ F. Jacoby, "Zur Entstehung der römischen Elegie," *RhM* 60 (1905) 72: "Ich bin geneigt . . . hierin [sc. in 2. 1. 1] einen Buchtitel zu sehen, und habe darum das an bevorzugter Stelle stehende *Amores* mit grossen Anfangbuchstaben geschrieben"; *Sex. Properti Elegiarum Liber II*, ed. by G. C. Giardina (Turin 1977) 90: "fort. prope tituli uice fungitur."

⁴⁵ To regard Cynthia here as a Muse or Muse-like figure (cf. especially Lieberg [above, note 32]) spoils Propertius' structurally important contrast of "natural" and "inspired" poetry. Martial applied this Propertian concept to Gallus at 8. 73. 6 *ingenium Galli pulchra Lycoris erat*.

poem. Instead, by attributing his poetry to Cynthia's words and deeds and looks and even clothes, he depicts himself as precisely what romantic criticism made him, a poet whose work springs immediately from personal experience. Callimachus is not mentioned, nothing is said about avoiding the highway or muddy waters, there are no colloquies with the Muses, no Callimachean images at all in fact; the farfetched claims to detect references to him (such as the suggestion that *causas* in 2. 1. 12 alludes to the *Aetia*)⁴⁶ are their own best refutation. In fact, as was argued above, the reader who comes to the tribiblos from the *Cynthia* has no reason to associate Propertius any more closely with Callimachus than with Theocritus or Meleager or Mimnermus; Callimachus' actual appearance in 2. 1. 39–40 (see below) amounts to nothing more than a casual allusion. Moreover, the way in which Propertius presents himself here not as a divinely inspired poet directed by Apollo or the Muses but as a poet of *ingenium*, an *ingenium* created entirely by Cynthia, makes him a highly implausible candidate for "Callimacheanship." Ancient literary criticism opposed *ingenium*, or "native talent," to *ars*, or "technical proficiency."⁴⁷ One who is a poet by virtue of *ingenium* hardly qualifies as Callimachean, for Callimachus himself was recognized as pre-eminent in *ars* but deficient precisely in this quality of *ingenium* (cf. *Ov. Am.* 1. 15. 14, quoted in note 47).

⁴⁶ So J. F. Miller, "Disclaiming Divine Inspiration: A Programmatic Pattern," *WS* 99 (1986) 151–64; the point was anticipated by J. E. G. Zetzel, "Recreating the Canon: Augustan Poetry and the Alexandrian Past," *Critical Inquiry* 10 (1983) 92, and is assumed by M. Wyke, "Reading Female Flesh: *Amores* 3. 1," in *History as Text*, ed. by Averil Cameron (London 1989) 136–37. Further claims made by some or all of these authorities include: that *Iliads* of 14 alludes to the writing of epic; that *historia* in 16 alludes to the writing of history (an odd alternative for a poet); that *laudatis . . . comis* in 8 alludes, by a bilingual pun, to *encomia* (this disregards the different quantities of the o-vowels in ἐγκώμιον and κόμη; disordered hair seems an odd occasion for praise-poetry in any case, though perhaps no stranger than Cynthia's somnolence as a cause for aetiology—it is more likely that aetiology would provoke that somnolence); that *lyrae* in 9 alludes to lyric poetry (though this would of course make Cynthia, not Propertius, the poet); and that the Coan silks of 6 allude to Philitas. This last point raises the question of how one tells when Coan silks are a literary symbol and when they are just a see-through dress. R. Thomas, in "Callimachus Back in Rome," in M. A. Harder, R. F. Regtuit, and G. C. Wakker (eds.), *Callimachus*, Hellenistica Groningana 1 (Groningen 1993) 197–215, has suggested that "Prop. 1. 2, with its metaphorical play on Coan silk and the like might suggest a greater programmatic importance" for Philitas in Propertius (198); but if the silks in 1. 2. 1–2 are indeed metaphorical, then Propertius is complaining to Cynthia there not about her expensive and revealing taste in clothing but about her pleasure in being celebrated in his Philitean poetry (note the presence of the key stylistic term *tenuis*!).

⁴⁷ For the opposition, see Cicero's famous assessment of Lucretius *multis luminibus ingeni, multae tamen artis* (*Q. Fr.* 2. 9. 3); Hor. *Ars* 295–96 *ingenium miserum quia fortunatus arte / credit* (sc. Democritus), with Brink's commentary; *Ov. Tr.* 2. 424 *Ennius ingenio maximus, arte rudis*; and for Callimachus himself *Am.* 1. 15. 14 *quamvis ingenio non ualeat, arte ualeat*, with McKeown's commentary; for prose, see Quint. *Inst.* 1. 8. 8 *quamquam plerique plus ingenio quam arte ualuerunt*, 10. 1. 40 *ingeniosis quidem sed arte carentibus*. Propertius himself makes the contrast only once, at 2. 24. 23 *contendat mecum ingenio, contendat et arte*; the implication that Propertius possesses *ars* as well as *ingenium* does not invalidate the point made here, for *ars* to some degree characterizes all poetry: Propertius is asserting his superiority to his rival in both categories rather than claiming possession of a specifically Callimachean *ars*.

This "preCallimachean" Propertius next addresses the concerns of his patron Maecenas by describing the sort of poetry he would write if he were capable of writing epic (2. 1. 17–38):

quod mihi si tantum, Maecenas, fata dedissent ut possem heroas ducere in arma manus, non ego Titanas canerem, non Ossan Olympo impositam ut caeli Pelion esset iter,	20
nec ueteres Thebas nec Pergama, nomen Homeri, Xerxis et imperio bina coisse uada, regnaue prima Remi aut animos Carthaginis altae Cimbrorumque minas et benefacta Mari:	25
bellaque resque tui memorarem Caesaris, et tu Caesare sub magno cura secunda fores.	
nam quotiens Mutinam aut, ciuilia busta, Philippos aut canerem Siculae classica bella fugae euersosque focos antiquae gentis Etruscae et Ptolemaei litora capta Phari	30
aut canerem Aegyptum et Nilum, cum attractus in Urbem septem captiuis debilis ibat aquis, aut regum auratis circumdata colla catenis Actiaque in Sacra currere rostra Via,	35
te mea musa illis semper contexeret armis, et sumpta et posita pace fidele caput. [Theseus infernis, superis testatur Achilles hic Ixioniden, ille Menoetiaden.] ⁴⁸	

This passage is the first of a series that will explore the alternatives to love poetry and will eventually culminate in the Callimachean aetiological poetry of Book 4; for now, however, the alternative is historical epic, and the implied model is not Callimachus but Ennius.⁴⁹ Of course Propertius' talent, being the creation of Cynthia, cannot compass any other subject; but he asserts that, if things were otherwise and he *could* write epic, his subject would not be a *Gigantomachy* or a *Thebaid* or an *Iliad* or historical themes from the Greek or Roman past but the *bellaque resque* of Octavian. Accordingly there follows a survey of Octavian's less than admirable career⁵⁰ culminating in four lines devoted to the glorious triumph over

⁴⁸ An intrusive and irrelevant couplet rightly deleted by Fontein, Struve, and half a dozen others.

⁴⁹ The explicit contrast of Ennius and Callimachus is reserved for the programmatic poems 3, 3 and 4. 1.

⁵⁰ This passage has provoked suspicion that Propertius is trying to embarrass Octavian by recalling disgraceful episodes from his past; Gold, *Literary Patronage* 160 and 166, for example, speaks of Propertius "needling" Augustus. For a particularly extreme statement, see N. Wiggers, "A Reconsideration of Propertius II,1," *CJ* 72 (1977) 334–41: "the reference to the Perusine War disrupts the otherwise chronological list of events . . . : the spectre of Perugia emerges unexpectedly, as if Propertius has tried to suppress, but could not bring himself to censor, his own memory of the sacrilege committed there. More obviously [*sic!*], the allusion to desecrated hearths (*euersos focos* 29) accuses Augustus of impiety toward god and man" (336). Such reactions are inappropriate for two reasons. First, any account of Octavian's rise

But this pledge that he would celebrate the achievements of Augustus if he possessed the talent for writing epic is immediately negated by a reaffirmation of his status as an elegist (2. 1. 39–46):

Callimachus' first appearance in Propertius' poetry is an offhand remark that amounts to little more than "Callimachus doesn't do it; and in any case neither can I." This cannot be taken as a major statement of affiliation by a writer who makes his real declarations in the obvious and emphatic terms of

⁵³ The obviously defective syntax of this couplet is usually repaired by adopting the Renaissance conjecture *uersamus*, but the assumption of a lacuna after 45 is less abrupt. Moreover, *contra* ("on the other hand," "on the contrary") follows more naturally after 41–42, which state what Propertius will not do, than after 43–44, which enumerate behaviours analogous to his own.

poems like 3. 1, 3. 3, 4. 1, and 4. 6, especially given that Callimachean critical motifs are in short supply here. Propertius' use of *intonare*, however, shows that he is not unaware of an important Callimachean programmatic context, the prologue to the *Aetia* with its famous pronouncement βροντᾶν οὐκ ἐμὸν, ἀλλὰ Διός (fr. 1. 20 Pfeiffer); the Dream that follows in that same prologue will figure prominently in 2. 34 and 3. 3. It was important to Propertius' larger structure to mention Callimachus here as one of the constellation of three figures, representing three poetic alternatives, featured in the major programmatic elegies that open each book: Cynthia, currently the source of his inspiration and so determining his status as love poet; Ennius, the model for the promised historical epic honouring Octavian (here only implied, but in 3. 3 Propertius will dream that he could be the Augustan Ennius, and only in 4. 1 will he decisively reject Ennius in favour of Callimachus); and Callimachus, whose aetiological elegy will eventually provide the form wherein Propertius, while remaining an elegist, can produce patriotic poetry that is ideologically equivalent to the hypothetical Ennian epic. The "story" of the tribiblos is on one level the conflict between Cynthia-poetry and the need or ambition to attempt other kinds of poetry; before the dream of 3. 3 that alternative is an Augustan epic (this, of course, is completely inconceivable in terms of metre and temperament), after the dream it is emulation of Alexandrian learned elegy (this is at least feasible, though difficult and dry). This conflict is intimately bound to the conflict within the "relationship," as difficulties and disappointments with Cynthia inevitably drive the poet, who claims that his talent depends upon Cynthia, to seek other artistic outlets. The passing reference to Callimachus here thus prepares the way in a sense for the future developments that will lead to the Roman *Aetia* of Book 4. In any case Callimachean precedent is only a secondary reason to the one enumerated in 45–46, that each person must toil at what he does well; in Propertius' case this is loving and writing poetry from the experience, and so he effectively returns to the position he had affirmed at the poem's start.

In the elegy's remaining lines Propertius turns from the poetry generated by his experience of love to that experience itself. The unity of the poem, which some have doubted, lies in the fact that the themes broached here, such as death in love, are found interwoven with the themes of inspiration and poetry not only here but in several other programmatic contexts as well (especially 2. 13 and 4. 7); we have in fact a poem that lays out the major structural themes of the entire tribiblos (it may also be worth noting that the last pentameter, ending *fatum dura puella fuit* seems to echo the first, *ingenium . . . ipsa puella facit*) (2. 1. 47–78):

laus in amore mori: laus altera, si datur una⁵⁴
posse frui: fruar o solus amore meo!

⁵⁴ So Heinsius for the transmitted *uno*.

[si memini, solet illa leues culpare puellas et totam ex Helena non probat Iliada.] ⁵⁵	50
seu mihi sunt tangenda nouercae pocula Phaedrae (pocula priuigno non nocitura suo), seu mihi Circaeο pereundum est gramine, siue Colchis Iolciacis urat aena focus, una meos quoniam praedata est femina sensus, ex hac ducentur funera nostra domo. omnes humanos sanat medicina dolores: solus Amor morbi non habet artificem. tarda Philoctetae sanauit crura Machaon, Phoenicis Chiron lumina Phyllyrides, et deus extinctum Cressis Epidaurius herbis restituit patriis Androgeona focus, ⁵⁶ Mysus et Haemonia iuuenis qua cuspidē uulnus senserat, hac ipsa cuspidē sensit opem: hoc siquis uitium poterit mihi demere, solus Tantaleae poterit tradere poma manu. dolia uirgineis idem ille repleuerit urnis ne tenera assidua colla graentur aqua, ⁵⁷ idem Caucasea soluet de rupe Promethei bracchia et a medio pectore pellet auem. quandocumque igitur uitam me ⁵⁸ fata reposcent et breue in exiguo marmore nomen ero, Maecenas, nostrae spes inuidiosa iuuentae, et uitae et mortis gloria iusta meae, si te forte meo ducet uia proxima busto, essedā caelatis siste Britanna iugis taliaque illacrimans mutae iace uerba fauillae: "huic misero fatum dura puella fuit."	55 55 60 65 70 75

Propertius begins in 47–48 by asserting first the glory of dying while a lover; then he specifies a particular condition which contributes to that glory (if one is able to enjoy a single love throughout), and further wishes that he might enjoy the ideal state of being Cynthia's sole lover, even as she is his. It is not certain whether the women of 51–54 are imagined as trying to poison Propertius or to work erotic magic on him,⁵⁹ but it is clear at least that the lines look back to 47–48 and suggest that Propertius intends to live up to the ideal of loyalty unto death which they expressed. The next section (57–70) explains how this is possible: Love is the only illness which cannot

⁵⁵ A charming couplet, but quite irrelevant here and rightly deleted by Carutti.

⁵⁶ This reference, which concerns resurrection rather than healing, probably belongs either at the end of the exempla as a climax (unlikely, since nothing emphasizes the miraculous nature of this particular "cure") or not at all.

⁵⁷ This couplet is rendered suspect by the overly emphatic *idem ille*, the inexplicable future perfect *repleuerit*, and the banal motive given for the action.

⁵⁸ An early correction of the transmitted *mea*.

⁵⁹ Phaedra's original attentions to Hippolytus were of course frankly erotic, while *pereundum est* and *urat* can both suggest love as well as literal death and burning.

be cured, and anyone who could help Propertius would also be capable of relieving the punishments of some celebrated sufferers. He seems here to define his love as a *uitium*, though one from which he does not shrink, unless we are to read a pointed message in the Tantalus exemplum, where freeing Propertius from this *uitium* is equated with feeding Tantalus, i.e. giving him something desirable which has long eluded his grasp. (The fact that the following two exempla are significantly less apt—their common element seems to be ending the suffering of famous criminals—may strengthen the suspicions expressed in note 57.) In the poem's conclusion, Propertius addresses to Maecenas the pathetic plea that, when he has been laid to rest in his tomb, his patron pause there a moment, should he find himself in the neighbourhood, and reflect sentimentally that Cynthia caused his doom. Here Propertius introduces the motif of the lover's burial, exploited again, generally in programmatic contexts, in 2. 11, 2. 13, 3. 16, and 4. 7, and the motif of the epitaph, for the quasi-epitaph to be uttered here by Maecenas is the first of a series for both Propertius (2. 13) and Cynthia (4. 7). That epitaph implies that by her cruelty or kindness the *puella* exercises the power of life and death over the unhappy poet; only later will Propertius realize that his *ingenium* gives him a comparable power over her.

Propertius' self-representation in 2. 1 involves a paradox that has implications for the entire *tribiblos*. He has denied the capacity for writing epic, on the grounds that his *puella* creates his talent, but he has defined his relationship with her as a sort of epic in which their love-making constitutes "long *Iliads*." This epic dimension of the affair is exploited above all in Book 2, where Propertius and Cynthia are frequently compared to such epic figures as Achilles, Hector, Helen, Briseis, Odysseus, and Penelope (in fact the only allusion to such characters in the *Cynthia* is a passing reference to Odysseus at 1. 15. 9). Already in 2. 3 Cynthia is a second Helen, *digna quidem facies pro qua uel obiret Achilles* (39). In 2. 8 and 2. 9 we have a pair of poems involving epic paradigms. In 2. 8, Propertius raging over the loss of Cynthia is like Achilles raging over the loss of Briseis and losing Patroclus in the process (29–36). In 2. 9, Cynthia is neither the patient Penelope awaiting Odysseus (3–8) nor the faithful Briseis mourning Achilles (9–14). In 2. 20. 1–2 the weeping Cynthia is compared to Briseis and to Andromache. In 2. 22. 29–32 Propertius compares his own ability to handle two love affairs to Achilles going from Briseis' embrace to defeat the Trojans and Hector rising from Andromache's bed to attack the Greek ships. And when he anticipates his death and burial in 2. 13, he avers that his tomb will be as famous as that of Achilles (2. 13. 37–38). Only in Book 2 does Propertius so consistently use epic figures as analogues for himself and for Cynthia; by thus affiliating his love affair generically with epic, yet denying the capacity to write epic poetry, he is setting the stage for what would seem to be an inevitable rejection of this "epic" affair in favour of some other kind of poetry better suited to his talent as an elegist.

When he said that Cynthia created his talent, Propertius recalled only her pleasant side, and the next two elegies explore those charms in some detail. But Cynthia, like the homonymous moon, has her dark side as well, and it too inspires poetry; elegies 5, 6, 8, and 9 all deal with her promiscuity or infidelity. As early as 2. 5 there are suggestions of trouble (2. 5. 1–10, 21–30):

hoc uerum est, tota te ferri, Cynthia, Roma,
 et non ignota uiuere nequitia?
 haec merui sperare? dabis mihi perfida poenas,
 et nobis † aquilo†, Cynthia, uentus erit.
 inueniam tamen e multis fallacibus unam 5
 quae fieri nostro carmine nota uelit
 nec mihi tam duris insultet moribus et te
 uellicet: heu, sero flebis amata diu!
 nunc est ira recens, nunc est discedere tempus:
 si dolor afuerit, crede, redibit amor. 10
 . . .
 nec tibi periuro scindam de corpore uestis
 nec mea praeclusas fregerit ira fores
 nec tibi conexos iratus carpere crinis
 nec duris ausim laedere pollicibus:
 rusticus haec aliquis tam turpia proelia quaerat, 25
 cuius non hederæ circumiere caput.
 scribam igitur, quod non unquam tua debeat aetas,
 "Cynthia forma potens, Cynthia uerba leuis."
 crede mihi, quamuis contemnas murmura famae,
 hic tibi pallori, Cynthia, uersus erit. 30

Having evidence of Cynthia's infidelities, which violate the ideal of exclusive possession expressed in 2. 1. 47–48, Propertius threatens to reject her and to take a literary revenge. The way in which he formulates the rejection (that he will "find a woman willing to become famous in his poetry") goes to the heart of the poet–*domina* relationship, which is founded upon the notion that the poet makes both himself and his mistress famous through his poetry; see also, for example, Tib. 1. 4. 61–66 (with Murgatroyd's note on 63–64), Ov. *Am.* 1. 3. 19–26 (with McKeown's note on 21–24), 1. 10. 59–62, *Ars* 3. 533–36, and see below for the theme elsewhere in Propertius. On this occasion, however, the threatened revenge will bring her only slight discredit, not total oblivion: Her beauty is not denied, only her morality. The scenario anticipates the two attempted rejections of Cynthia that will follow in 2. 10 and in 3. 24 + 25; for now, however, Propertius endures a good deal more disappointment in elegies 5, 6, 8, and 9 before putting such a scheme into action.

He does so in 2. 10, though this is only a false start, not the new beginning imagined by Lachmann (2. 10. 1–20):

sed tempus lustrare aliis Heliconæ choreis

et campum Haemonio iam dare tempus equo,
iam libet et fortis memorare ad proelia turmas
et Romana mei dicere castra ducis.
quodsi deficiant uires, audacia certe 5
laus erit: in magnis et uoluisse sat est.
aetas prima canat Veneres, extrema tumultus:
bella canam quando scripta puella mea est.
nunc uolo subducto grauior procedere uultu,
nunc aliam citharam me mea Musa docet. 10
surge, anime, ex humili iam carmine:⁶⁰ sumite uires,
Pierides: magni nunc erit oris opus.
iam negat Euphrates equitem post terga tueri
Parthorum et Crassos se tenuisse dolet:
India quin, Auguste, tuo dat colla triumpho 15
et domus intactae te tremit Arabiae,
et siqua extremis tellus se subtrahit oris
sentiat illa tuas postmodo capta manus!
haec ego castra sequar, uates tua castra canendo
magnus ero: seruent hunc mihi fata diem. 20

The new poetry that Propertius here declares it is time to write⁶¹ is precisely the celebration of Octavian's *bellaque resque* that in 2. 1 he promised he would provide were he capable of writing epic; here, however, he emphasizes future, not past, accomplishments, for the very good reason that he has no intention of writing such poetry, at any rate not in the hexameters of Ennian historical epic implied here. Recollection of the earlier statement that Cynthia creates his talent raises an important question: With her gone from his life and already "written," can he write any kind of poetry, much less the sort pledged here? Propertius, his *ingenium* still dependent upon Cynthia, is predictably forced to capitulate, and in a sudden about-face he declares himself incapable of writing epic, offering in its place what he calls *uilia tura*; his songs do not yet know even the springs of Ascræ, for Amor has only bathed in the Permessus (2. 10. 21–26):

ut caput in magnis ubi non est tangere signis
ponitur † hac†⁶² imos ante corona pedes,
sic nos nunc, inopes laudis conscendere † carmen†,⁶³

⁶⁰ It is better to retain this, the reading of the archetype, than to accept *carmina*, which is either a scribal error of F or a conjecture of Petrarch; there seems to be an intentional and thematically significant contrast between the *humile carmen* of 11 and the *magni oris opus* of 12.

⁶¹ Ross 119 asserts that Propertius is promising "to undertake Augustan epic in his old age" despite acknowledging the poet's repeated use of *nunc* with the present tense. Others have tried to weaken the reality of Propertius' promise by attributing to *quando* (8) a temporal as well as a causal sense (endorsed by Wimmel 194), but the former would require a future perfect, while the present perfect *scripta est* shows that only the causal sense can apply.

⁶² Clearly corrupt, with no plausible remedy suggested.

⁶³ This too is corrupt, and two equally plausible conjectures have been proposed, Passerat's *culmen* and Markland's *currum*.

pauperibus sacris uilia tura damus.
 nondum etiam⁶⁴ Ascraeos norunt mea carmina fontis, 25
 sed modo Permessi flumine lauit Amor.

Only here and in 12 and 13 is Amor represented as the governing deity of Propertius' poetry. The reason for this is not difficult to deduce. He has denied the inspiration of conventional figures like Apollo and Calliope and insisted that his experience of Cynthia creates his talent; but he has rejected Cynthia as lover and as subject, and therefore has only his *amor Cynthiae*, not Cynthia herself, to direct his course.⁶⁵ To see the retreat as politically motivated is short-sighted; within the perspective of the whole tribiblos it is clear that Propertius does eventually fulfill the promise to write poetry for Augustus, in 3. 11, in 4. 6, in the epicedia for family members (3. 18, 4. 11), and in the aetiological elegies of Book 4. Epic will always remain impossible for purely aesthetic and personal reasons, but homage will not. (For further observations on the interpretation of 25–26, see below).

As to the *uilia tura* that Propertius offers Augustus in place of the epic he cannot yet write, commentators rush to explain that incense was "a poor man's offering" but not to elucidate what it represents in this context; if pressed, most would probably say that it is 2. 10 itself, with its unfulfilled promise. Perhaps, though that would be cheap incense indeed; but perhaps it is the following epigram, which most editions mark as 2. 11 (2. 11. 1–6):

scribant de te alii uel sis ignota licebit:
 laudet qui sterili semina ponit humo.
 omnia, crede mihi, tecum uno munera lecto
 auferet extremi funeris atra dies,
 et tua transibit contemnens ossa uiator, 5
 nec dicet "cinis hic docta puella fuit."

In fact only N makes this a separate elegy, and there is therefore manuscript support for reading it as an epigram incorporated within 2. 10 rather than as an independent poem. (Burman and Rothstein mark no division but also suggest no compelling connection between 10 and 11.) The poem is "incense" for Augustus in the sense that, while not a poem of direct praise, it represents a rejection of the kind of poetry that Propertius has written previously and so leaves room for a change of direction (for poetry as a form of worship, see below, note 97); it is "cheap" in the literary sense, epigram being a humbler type than epic or even elegy. This rejection of Cynthia goes to the very heart of the poet–*domina* relationship, founded upon the exchange of love and inspiration for poetic immortality. Frustrated by her ingratitude (by which he means her infidelity), he will no longer write about her: No matter to him if she is utterly forgotten.

⁶⁴ The conjecture *etenim* (Nodell, Fontein, Müller) would supply a much needed causal link with what precedes.

⁶⁵ Contrast the parodic reversal in Ovid, *Am.* 1. 1–3, where Amor inspires the poet, who must then go out and find an object for his love.

Without his poetry, he implies, all her gifts and accomplishments—those very things which he said in 2. 1 inspired and indeed became his poetry—will perish with her upon the pyre rather than living forever through the literature they inspire; travellers passing by her tomb will not acknowledge it as the monument of a *docta puella*. Though not a funerary epigram per se, the poem exploits funerary motifs and suggests an epitaph:⁶⁶ Without the vivifying gift of Propertius' poetry, Cynthia is as good as dead, deprived of the everlasting life that he will later say⁶⁷ can be won only through *ingenium*, for her fame, like her mortal body, will not survive, and even her name will be unknown (*CiNis* is perhaps a deliberately remote echo of *CyNthia*). Burial by the roadside and the words spoken (or rather not spoken) at the tomb recall Propertius' own case at the end of 2. 1. But the epigram also looks ahead to Cynthia's "real" burial in 4. 7; treated in death as negligently as 2. 11 implies, she will return to seek control of both her monument and her renown.

Logically 2. 10 and 11 should be the end of Propertius' poetic career, since he has abandoned the woman responsible for his talent.⁶⁸ How, then, does he survive to write another 3,000 lines? The answer is that these elegies are only the beginning of a cycle in which rejection is followed by relapse and reconciliation, a cycle which will be recapitulated in different terms in Books 3 and 4. The relapse begins immediately in 2. 12, a meditation upon Amor that, for all its frequently noted resemblance to formal rhetorical and poetic exercises, has a direct bearing upon Propertius' present situation as both lover and poet. He is, after all, a poet-lover trying to be out of love with the source of his poetic inspiration; having rejected Cynthia as subject of his verse, only his *amor Cynthiae* is left for him to write about, and so Amor now becomes his poetic guide. Propertius emphasizes the instability which Amor brings to lovers' lives, the suddenness of his attacks and the incurable wounds they inflict (2. 12. 1–12):

quicumque ille fuit puerum qui pinxit Amorem,
 nonne putas miras hunc habuisse manus?
 is primum uidit sine sensu uiuere amantis
 et leuibus curis magna perire bona:
 idem non frustra uentosas addidit alas
 fecit et humano corde uolare deum,
 scilicet alterna quoniam iactamur in unda
 nostraque non ullis permanet aura locis,

5

⁶⁶ For the resemblance of 2. 11 to sepulchral epigram, see Wyke 54.

⁶⁷ 3. 2. 25–26 *at non ingenio quaesitum nomen ab aeuo / excidet: ingenio stat sine morte decus*.

⁶⁸ Wyke 54 n. 44 draws attention to the observation of J.-P. Boucher in *Études sur Propertius* (Paris 1965) 354 that "in the Propertian corpus epigrammatic poems occur elsewhere only at the ends of books"; thus Propertius seems deliberately to have created a deceptive effect of closure here to suggest that his work has in fact come to an end.

et merito hamatis manus est armata sagittis
 et pharetra ex umero Cnosia utroque iacet, 10
 ante ferit quoniam tuti quam cernimus hostem
 nec quisquam ex illo uulnere sanus abit.

Even in his general treatment of Amor the elements chosen are appropriate to his present situation, and they become even more appropriate as he passes from the general to the specific. Propertius particularly emphasizes the persistence of his *amor*: The god has lost his wings, never flies from his heart, and fights an unending battle within his veins (2. 12. 13–16):

in me tela manent, manet et puerilis imago,
 sed certe pennas perdidit ille suas,
 euolat heu nostro quoniam de pectore nusquam 15
 assiduusque meo sanguine bella gerit.

Propertius' dismissal of Cynthia implied that he wanted Amor to depart, but the god would not go and the result was only conflict; wasted by the onslaught, he begs the boy to fly elsewhere and afflict someone else before he is utterly destroyed (2. 12. 17–24):

quid tibi iucundum est siccis habitare medullis?
 si pudor est, alio traice tela, puer!⁶⁹
 intactos isto satius temptare ueneno:
 non ego sed tenuis uapulat umbra mea. 20
 quam si perdideris, quis erit qui talia cantet
 (haec mea musa leuis gloria magna tua est),
 qui caput et digitos et lumina nigra puellae
 et canat ut soleant molliter ire pedes?

The terms in which he tries to buy his release imply a willingness to return to Cynthia or at least to love poetry (the lack of articles in Latin leaves it unclear whether *puellae* in 23 is "of a girl" or "of the girl," i.e. Cynthia), but in any case all the details emphasized in 2. 12 suggest a relapse, or at least the struggle preceding one: Amor is unstable because Propertius, having tried to escape, is now wavering in his resolve, and he has lost his wings because Propertius has not shaken free of Cynthia after all; warfare rages within the poet's veins as his desire for Cynthia conquers resentment of her ill-treatment.

The desire for reconciliation becomes explicit in 2. 13,⁷⁰ where Amor is again both the god of love who has shot Propertius' heart full of arrows

⁶⁹ The manuscripts give this line in the form *si puer est alio traice puella tuo*; the version printed here is the one preferred by both Politian and Housman, among others.

⁷⁰ The most recent discussion of this elegy is Heyworth, "Propertius 2. 13"; like others, including Wyke and Ross, he relies upon L. P. Wilkinson, "The Continuity of Propertius ii. 13," *CR* 16 (1966) 141–44, which argued for the unity of the elegy (divided by many editors at 17) on the basis of supposed shared Callimachean imagery. That division may well be correct and the first 16 lines could be the conclusion of 2. 12 (as proposed by Hemsterhuys); they certainly share the theme of Amor's continuing dominance over the poet's heart and pen, but in a linear reading questions of where elegies begin and end are less important than reading the

and the god of poetry who has made Cynthia not merely the subject but the object of his poetry, the only audience he desires (2. 13. 1–8):

non tot Achaemeniis armantur Susa⁷¹ sagittis
 spicula quot nostro pectore fixit Amor.
 hic⁷² me tam⁷³ gracilis uetuit contemnere musas
 iussit et Ascræum sic habitare nemus
 non ut Pieriae quercus mea uerba sequantur
 aut possim Ismaria ducere ualle feras,
 sed magis ut nostro stupefiat Cynthia uersu:
 tunc ego sim Inachio notior arte Lino.

5

The assertion that Amor *me tam gracilis uetuit contemnere musas* confirms the interpretation of 2. 12 offered above: Love (or Propertius' *amor Cynthiae*) has prevented Propertius abandoning the *musae tenues* of love elegy for epic.⁷⁴ But the further assertion that Amor "has commanded me to inhabit the Ascræan grove" in order to dazzle Cynthia with poetry, in close proximity to the earlier one that "my songs do not yet know even the Ascræan springs" has been one of the abiding puzzles of Propertian scholarship;⁷⁵ it is now time to address this problem together with the related question of the waters mentioned in 2. 10.

entire contents of the book as a coherent, continuous whole. Moreover, *pace* Wilkinson and his followers, Propertius is not yet an avowedly Callimachean poet, and many of the supposed Callimachean allusions are decidedly slight. "Light" and "heavy," "small" and "large" genres existed before Callimachus; cf. F. Wehrli, "Der erhabene und der schlichte Stil in der poetisch-rhetorischen Theorie der Antike," in *Phyllobolia: Festschrift P. Von der Mühl*, ed. by O. Gigon et al. (Basel 1946) 9–34. Not everything small or soft or wet in Latin poetry is a Callimachean symbol, and elegy would still be "soft" and "slight" by comparison with epic and tragedy even if Callimachus had never been born (cf. Cameron [above, note 30] 474; "All elegists were automatically *molles*"). Heyworth, "Propertius 2. 13" and "Propertius: Division" both argue that the beginning of Propertius' third book should be sought at 2. 13, not 2. 10; but it seems odd that the poet should begin a new book in mid-quarrel, hoping for a reconciliation, and anticipating his funeral.

⁷¹ This Renaissance conjecture is the most likely restoration of the archetype's *armatur etrusca*; haplography first reduced *Susa* to *su* (which later became *sca*), and *etru* was corrupted out of a dittography of *-atur*. A. Allen, "Armed Camps in Propertius," *RhM* 135 (1992) 95–96, proposes *armantur castra*, but surely style demands a specific geographical term to balance *Achaemeniis*. Claud. 15. 32–33 mentions *pharetrata* . . . / *Susa*.

⁷² We should perhaps consider adopting *sic* here, referring back to the action of shooting Propertius' heart full of arrows, while *sic* in the next line sets up the following *ut* clauses.

⁷³ Ayrmann's *iam* deserves some consideration, especially if 2. 13 is not joined to 2. 12.

⁷⁴ The *musae* here are none of the Heliconian nine but simply "songs" or "poetry," a usage employed again by Propertius at 4. 4. 51 *utinam magicæ nossem cantamina musæ* (see *ThLL* VIII 1694. 40–80 for further examples). The three passages where Propertius speaks of *mea musa* probably involve the same idiom (2. 1. 35, 2. 10. 10, 2. 12. 22; cf. also 3. 1. 9–10 *a me / nata* . . . *musa*, though *nata* may be corrupt). For similar expressions with possessives, see Call. fr. 112. 1 Pfeiffer ἐμὴ μοῦσα, *AP* 5. 134. 3–4 ἄ τε Κλεάνθους μοῦσα, 9. 571. 2 μοῦσα Σιμωνίδεω, Stat. S. 2. 7. 75 *musa rudis ferocis Enni*.

⁷⁵ For recent discussions, see Wimmel 233–37; Wyke 57–60; Heyworth, "Propertius 2. 13" 52; Ross 32–36 and 119–20, with the commentaries on both 2. 10. 25–26 and 2. 13. 3–4; see now also R. O. A. M. Lyne, *Horace: Behind the Public Poetry* (New Haven and London 1995) 36–37.

The closing lines of 2. 10, *pace* Ross, do indeed distinguish between the *Ascraei fontes* and the *Permessi flumen*,⁷⁶ and this distinction, ever since Passerat, has been regarded as a hierarchical ranking in which the Ascræan spring—whether Hippocrene or Aganippe—represents epic and Permessus represents lower forms like erotic poetry.⁷⁷ But such a distinction comports some serious difficulties. First, it is difficult to see what real contrast can exist between the Permessus and *fontes Ascraei*; since the Permessus occupies the same mountain as Hippocrene and Aganippe, it is a *fons Ascraeus* (in the broader sense of “Boeotian”) no less than they are. Second, only Heyworth among the scholars cited in note 75 has seen that the Ascræan spring, if we take the epithet strictly, should represent Hesiodic, not Homeric, poetry, that is, didactic or mythological, not epic; this is implied not only by Hesiod’s connection with Ascra but also by comparison of Propertius’ obvious immediate model, Gallus’ initiation in Virgil, *Eclogues* 6. 64–73:

tum canit errantem Permessi ad flumina Gallum	
Aonas in montis ut duxerit una Sororum,	65
utque uiro Phoebi chorus adsurrexerit omnis:	
ut Linus haec illi diuino carmine pastor	
floribus atque apio crinis ornatus amaro	
dixerit “hos tibi dant calamos—en, accipe—Musae,	
Ascraeo quos ante seni, quibus ille solebat	70
cantando rigidas deducere montibus ornos.	
his tibi Grynei nemoris dicatur origo	
ne quis sit lucus quo se plus iactet Apollo.”	

Gallus’ passage from *Permessi flumina* to *Aones montes*, from (presumably) his *Amores* to an aetiological poem (*nemoris . . . origo*) explicitly equated with the poetry of “the old man of Ascra,” clearly inspired the passage which Propertius’ poetry has not yet made from *Permessi flumen* to *Ascraei fontes*. The choice of model is deliberate and significant. First, the implicit comparison between Propertius and Gallus anticipates the catalogue of elegists, including Gallus, with which Propertius will close the book (see below on 2. 34); second, the statement that Propertius’ poetry does not yet

⁷⁶ Ross 119–20 argues against the distinction, but the adversative *sed modo* (26) is difficult to explain otherwise; he is also forced to take Amor in the same line as identifying Propertius’ poetry rather than the god who guides it, and interprets *lauit Amor* as the poetry bathing itself (“Love . . . only has bathed in the Permessus”; “his love elegy has bathed in the same waters” 120). There is a certain logical difficulty in saying that Propertius’ poems do not yet know the water in which they have just bathed.

⁷⁷ For example, Giardina (above, note 44) “ita intellege: Ascraeo fonte heroicam poesin, Permessi flumine amatoriam significari”; Enk identifies the *Ascraei fontes* as Hippocrene, La Penna as Aganippe (*L’Integrazione difficile: Un profilo di Propertio* [Turin 1977] 224–25); for Rothstein “es kann . . . kein Zweifel sein, dass der Gegensatz zwischen den askräischen Quellen und dem Permessus eine symbolische Bezeichnung des Gegensatzes zwischen epischer und erotischer Poesie ist”; Heyworth, “Propertius 2. 13” 52 identifies Permessus as the stream of love elegy, the Ascræan springs as signifying “aetiological, or at any rate more elevated, poetry such as Gallus’s piece on the Grynean grove.”

know these springs shows that he has not advanced as far stylistically as Gallus did in composing aetiological poetry, but it also implies an ambition to do so, to be fulfilled of course in the Roman *Aetia* of Book 4. In context, Propertius seems to be saying that he cannot undertake the promised (Homeric) epic on Augustus' campaigns because his poetry, far from knowing Homer's spring, does not yet know *even* (*etiam*) Hesiod's (the "middle ground" between epic and the lower genres).

A third and particularly serious objection to the supposed hierarchical ranking of springs in 2. 10. 25–26 is that it is attested nowhere else. From Servius' statement on *Eclogues* 10. 12, that *Callimachus Aganippen fontem esse dicit Permessi fluminis*, it has been argued that the derivative Permessus enjoyed a lesser status than Hippocrene. But the commentary on the *Aetia* preserved in P. Oxy. 2262 suggests that Callimachus in fact said the opposite and made Permessus the source of Aganippe⁷⁸ (which he seems to have called "the daughter of Permessus," whence Pausanias' statement at 9. 29. 5 θυγατέρα δὲ εἶναι τὴν Ἀγανίπην τοῦ Τερμησσοῦ λέγουσι; Termessus is another name for Permessus); he may also have regarded Permessus as the source of Hippocrene itself, if it was Callimachus who made the identification of Aganippe and Hippocrene propounded elsewhere by the same scholiast.⁷⁹ Moreover, as Hertzberg has observed, a difference in status is unlikely in any case, since in Hesiod Permessus as a bathing place seems no less sacred to the Muses than Hippocrene and the obscure Olmeius, and indeed is not distinguished from them. Certainly in later poetry the Permessus, no less than Aganippe or Hippocrene, became a conventional symbol of poetry plain and simple, not of some particular kind,⁸⁰ and the drinking of water from the springs on Helicon had become a conventional symbol of inspiration, so that Hesiod could be described as drinking from them even though he never represented himself as having done so. Nicander had Hesiod sing παρ' ὕδασι Περμησσοῖο (*Th.* 12); an epigram of Alcaeus had him "tasting the pure drops of the nine Muses" (*AP* 7. 55. 5–6 ἐννέα Μουσέων / ὁ πρέσβυς καθαρῶν γευσάμενος λιβάδων); an epigram of Asclepiades says that the Muses "gave [him] the inspired water of the Heliconian spring" (*AP* 9. 64. 5 δῶκαν δὲ κρήνης Ἑλικωνίδος ἔνθεον ὕδωρ); in another epigram Straton says that Helicon "often" gushed "eloquent water" for Hesiod from its springs (*AP* 11. 24. 1–2 σὺ μὲν ποτε πολλάκις ὕδωρ / εὐεπὲς ἐκ πηγῶν ἔβλυσας Ἑσιόδῳ) and declares that he would rather have a single cup

⁷⁸ P. Oxy. 2262 fr. 2(a), col. i. 20–24: Περμησσοῦ· Περμησσός / ποταμός τῆς Βοιω-
τίας ἐξ οὗ ἔχειν τὰς / πηγὰς λέγεται ἢ προ-/ειρη]μένη Ἀγανίπη.

⁷⁹ P. Oxy. 2262 fr. 2(a), col. i. 16–19: Ἀγανίπη·] κρήνη ἐν Ἑλικῶν/νι. ἢ δ' αὐτὴ καὶ
Πηγασ(ίς) / καλεῖται καὶ Ἰπποκρή-/νη].

⁸⁰ Mart. 1. 76. 11 *quid tibi cum Cirrha, quid cum Permesside nuda?*, 8. 70. 3 concerning Nerva, "the Tibullus of our age," who *cum siccare sacrum largo Permessida posset / ore, uerecundam maluit esse sitim*; Claud. *Laus Ser. 8 fons Aganippea Permessius educat unda*; Mart. Cap. 809 *coepistine Permesiaci gurgitis sitire fontes?*

from his beloved boy than a thousand from Pegasus (for the identification of this as Aganippe see above, note 79); and a late hexameter poem full of Hesiodic reminiscences may have made him drink from Aganippe.⁸¹

In fact the only distinction that Propertius appears to draw implicitly is a temporal one: Knowledge of the *Ascraei fontes* is assumed to come after the bath in the *Permessi flumen* (cf. *nondum* 25). The same sequence is enacted in Virgil; Gallus wanders first *Permessi ad flumen*, then is led up *Aonas in montis*. In Virgil, however, there is a clear difference in altitude that reflects the difference in genre between love poetry and loftier Hesiodic aetiology; Propertius seems to obscure this by replacing the Boeotian mountain with Boeotian springs. On the other hand, Propertius adds to Virgil's picture the image of bathing in the Permessus; he alludes thereby to a hitherto insufficiently acknowledged source⁸² for both Virgil and himself, the opening of the *Theogony* (1–8, rather than the scene of "consecration" in 22–35):

Μουσάων Ἑλικωνιάδων ἀρχώμεθ' αἰδεῖν,
αἴθ' Ἑλικῶνος ἔχουσιν ὄρος μέγα τε ζαθέον τε
καὶ τε περὶ κρήνην ἰοιδέα πόσσ' ἀπαλοῖσιν
ὀρχεῦνται καὶ βωμὸν ἔρισθενέος Κρονίωνος.
καὶ τε λουσάμεναι τέρενα χροά Περμησσοῖο
ἢ Ἴππου κρήνης ἢ Ὀλμειοῦ ζαθέοιο
ἀκροτάτῳ Ἑλικῶνι χοροὺς ἐνεποιήσαντο
καλοῦς, ἡμερόεντας· ἐπερρώσαντο δὲ ποσσίν.

5

Here Virgil's contrast between Permessus and the heights of Helicon is already suggested by Hesiod's implication (conveyed through the aorist participle λουσάμεναι) that the Muses bathe first in Permessus or Hippocrene or Olmeius before their "fair, lovely dances" at the very top of Helicon (ἀκροτάτῳ Ἑλικῶνι). In Hesiod, however, there is no contrast of genres, and the bathing is simply the natural preliminary activity to the dancing. Perhaps Virgil meant to suggest that Gallus' elegies had been a sort of *prolusio* before his more significant and difficult aetiological poem, but he certainly seems to have exploited the implicit difference in altitude between the places of bathing and dancing (logically, of course, every other place on the mountain must be lower than ἀκροτάτος Ἑλικῶν) as an image for the relative stylistic "elevation" of love elegies and Hesiodic aetiology; Gallus, as the author of difficult, Muse-inspired poetry, retraces the direction of the Muses' own activity to join them in their dances atop Helicon. Through his own allusion to Hesiod, Propertius suggests a similar contrast of preliminary activity and more serious poetry; but, as we have seen, he seems to do so through a contrast of the lower Permessus and some

⁸¹ P. Oxy. 3537 fr. 1. 17–18: μηλονόμοι Μοῦσαι [καλὴν μ' ἐδ]ίδαξαν αἰοιδήν, / ἐκ δ' ἐλόμην πολυ[]εύστου Ἀγανίπη[ς].

⁸² I have seen it mentioned only by Lyne (above, note 75) 37 n. 12, but he regards the allusion as humorous and does not discuss it in detail.

other spring. Some difficulties of this interpretation have been discussed above; they can perhaps be resolved by identifying his *Ascraei fontes* with the κρήνη ἰοειδής of *Theogony* 3 about which the Muses dance (presumably at the top of Helicon, if the dancing in 3–4 is the same as that in 5–8); *Ascraeus* would then have the generalized sense attributed to it by Postgate ad loc. in *Select Elegies of Propertius* (below, note 141): “Heliconian and hence poetic.” But the consistency with which Propertius’ Hesiodic and Virgilian models contrast the Permessus not with other streams but with the heights of Helicon should rouse the suspicion that Propertius did too, and that he originally wrote *nondum etiam Ascraeos norunt mea carmina MONTIS*. This would bring Propertius into a closer resemblance to his immediate model, with *Ascraeos . . . montis* echoing *Aonas in montis* as precisely as *Permessi flumine* echoes *Permessi ad flumina*. It would also be consistent with Propertius’ later references to the Muses, especially in 2. 30, where he speaks of visiting them upon their mountain, as Gallus does in *Eclogues* 6, but only if Cynthia accompanies him. Perhaps Propertius borrowed Virgil’s interpretation of the Hesiodic passage and imagined poets of more challenging genres ascending Helicon to join the Muses, in an allegory of the enhanced difficulty of their task and their consequent need for divine assistance. The chief advantages of the emendation are that it restores consistency among Hesiod and his Roman imitators and that it eliminates the need to invent an unattested hierarchy of streams, but it is not essential to the interpretations offered here.

If Propertius does indeed allude to the opening of the *Theogony* here, then perhaps we can explain the chief difficulty and ambiguity of 2. 10. 26 as well, the meaning of *lauit Amor*. Does Cupid wash Propertius, Propertius’ elegies, or himself? The Hesiodic model suggests that the last was intended. Virgil had the poet Gallus himself enact the Muses’ progress by ascending Helicon; Propertius assigns that role to Amor, his guiding divinity in this stretch of Book 2. Propertius’ poetry does not yet know the heights of Helicon (whether defined by *fontes* or by *montes*) because Amor has so far only bathed in the Permessus, not ascended to join the Muses’ dances; thus the poet emphasizes that his poetry is still Amor-inspired rather than Muse-inspired, the “natural,” spontaneous poetry implied by the opening of 2. 1 rather than the more challenging imitations of learned Hellenistic elegy like Gallus’ poem on the Grynean grove or his own subsequent Muse-inspired poem on Actium (4. 6). Of course Amor is enlisted here as the governing deity of Propertius’ poetry because that poetry is created from his love for Cynthia (and what better god to preside over the writing of *Amores*?), but casting Amor in the role of Hesiod’s Muses was all the easier given the use of *musa* to mean “poem” (above, note 74): Propertius’ *amores* are themselves *musae*. In summary, I propose that Propertius made no novel distinction among the springs of Helicon, but rather followed Hesiod and especially Virgil in distinguishing lower streams from mountain heights. From Hesiod’s Muses, who bathe before

they dance, came the notion of using the streams and the heights as metaphors of stages in the poet's development; from Virgil's Gallus came the refinement of that metaphor as a metaphor of the generic distinctions implicit in the stages of that development. In effect, Propertius is restating, in considerably more ambitious language, the position of 2. 1. 1-4: He is not yet ready to write difficult poetry under divine inspiration, but writes solely from his *amor Cynthiae*.

There remains the repetition of *Ascraeus* in 2. 10 and 13. The occurrences are so close that a cross-reference has been suspected; if that is so, it raises the question of whether "knowing the Ascraean springs" (or "mountains") and "inhabiting the Ascraean grove" are one and the same. The hypothesis that both refer to writing "Hesiodic" poetry entails fresh and insurmountable difficulties of its own. In 2. 10 Propertius says that he does not know the Ascraean springs (or mountains) because Love has only recently bathed in the Permessus, while in 2. 13 he says that Love has ordered him not to scorn light poetry (*tenuēs musae*) and to "inhabit the Ascraean grove" in a certain way. If Propertius in 2. 13 is indeed writing the "Ascraean" poetry which was still beyond his reach in 2. 10, then some sort of development has occurred; but surely such a development would be signalled in some obvious way, given Propertius' scrupulousness in detailing his poetic progress. In addition, while "Ascraean" might signify "Hesiodic" in the earlier passage, it cannot in the later, for it would be impossible for Propertius to write Hesiodic poetry *without* scorning the "slight muses" which represent his love poetry (and why would Amor be commanding non-erotic Hesiodic poetry?); in any case he is clearly not writing "Hesiodic" poetry, for nothing anywhere in Book 2 can be compared to the *Works and Days* or *Theogony* or *Eoiai* or even Gallus' Hesiodic poem on the Grynean grove. The discrepancy is best resolved by supposing that "inhabiting the Ascraean grove" means not "writing Hesiodic poetry" but simply "writing poetry." Propertius is occasionally somewhat loose with the terminology of poetic initiation, which had come conventionally to stand as metaphors for the composition of poetry,⁸³ and the presence of Helicon in Boeotia meant that epithets signifying "Boeotian" had come to mean simply "musical" or "poetic," even to Propertius himself.⁸⁴ It can be argued, then, that here too Propertius simply repeats in altered terms the same self-depiction as in 2. 1 and 2. 10,

⁸³ For example, his contemptuous dismissal at 2. 5. 15-16 of the rustic "whose head ivy has not surrounded" implies that he (as poet, of course) has been so crowned, yet he will say at 2. 30. 39-40 that "I will not suffer the sacred berries to hang upon my head" (i.e., be a poet) unless Cynthia joins the dance; at 2. 10. 1 he declares it time to "traverse Helicon" with different dances (as a symbol of poetry), yet only at 3. 3 does he even dream a first visit.

⁸⁴ Certainly the epithet *Ascraeus* need not have special point; Propertius uses *Aonius* at 1. 2. 28, *Aganippeus* at 2. 3. 20, and *Castalius* at 3. 3. 13 with no geographical significance. *Aonius* is applied to a lyre used for a bellicose epic at *Ov. Am.* 1. 1. 12 (*Aoniam Marte mouente lyram*) and is an epithet of poets generally at *Ov. Ars* 3. 547 (*uatibus Aoniis faciles estote, puellae*); at *Stat. S.* 3. 3. 32-33 *Aonias . . . inferias* refers to a poem of consolation.

reaffirming that his poetry derives from his love for Cynthia. Given the unreliability of the Propertian tradition, it also seems worth considering that the repetition of *Ascræus* is a phantom and is in fact the result of scribal error; Propertius perhaps wrote either *Aonios* . . . *fontis* (or *montis*) in 2. 10 or *Aonium* . . . *nemus* in 2. 13. It is worth adding that, if Propertius wrote *montis* in 2. 10. 25, the repetition of *Ascræus* is unmasked as another false problem like the phantom hierarchy of springs, for the word would unquestionably have in both cases the same meaning: "Heliconian and hence poetic," in Postgate's words.

That Propertius "inhabiting the Ascræan grove" has nothing to do with writing Hesiodic poetry is also clear from the purpose for which Amor has ordered him to write: not to charm oaks⁸⁵ or wild animals but to impress Cynthia (7 *ut nostro stupefiat Cynthia uersu*, picking up from *sic* in 4). Propertius seems content with Amor's instructions; when he can lie in the lap of his *docta puella* and win her approval, he will need the approbation of no-one else and could bear the enmity of Jove himself on one condition (2. 13. 9–16):

non ego sum formae tantum mirator honestae	
nec siqua illustris femina iactat auos:	10
me iuuat ⁸⁶ in gremio doctae legisse puellae	
auribus et puris scripta probasse mea.	
haec ubi contigerint, populi confusa ualeto	
fabula, nam domina iudice tutus ero.	
quae si forte bonas ad pacem uerterit auris,	15
possum inimicitias tunc ego ferre Iouis.	

As commentators note, the condition indicated in 15 implies an unresolved conflict⁸⁷ (none other, it may be contended, than the rejection initiated in 2. 10); with no such reconciliation in sight, however, Propertius spends the remainder of the poem preparing for death. There is even an effect of closure in the explicit reference back to 2. 1, as though the book were being rounded off through ring-composition (*quandocumque igitur* in 17, anticipating the day of the poet's death, inevitably recalls the same phrase in a similar context at 2. 1. 71), and again Propertius provides a false epitaph for himself (the *duo uersus* of 35–36 are only a verse and a half). But perhaps the most important link for 2. 13 is with 2. 11, to which it is a sort of pendant and complement. The poet–*domina* relationship was supposed to provide fame for both through the medium of poetry. In 2. 11,

⁸⁵ Propertius alludes again to *Ecl.* 6, where the Muses grant to Gallus the pipes *Ascræo quos ante seni, quibus ille solebat / cantando rigidas deducere montibus ornos* (70–71); the explicit denial for his own poetry of what Virgil attributes to Hesiod again suggests that "inhabiting the Ascræan grove" is not a specifically Hesiodic reference.

⁸⁶ The conjecture *iuuat*, found first in manuscript P (Paris, B.N. lat. 7989), must be right; a hypothetical or hortatory subjunctive hardly seems appropriate to the contrast with the earlier emphatic assertion *non sum*.

⁸⁷ "Hic versus ostendit Propertium Cynthiae animum nondum reconciliavisse" (Enk).

in the course of repudiating Cynthia as lover and as subject of his poetry, he declares that death will take away all her gifts and that passers-by will speak no words over her tomb; in other words, she will be unknown without the medium of his poetry. In 2. 13, on the other hand, Propertius asserts that his own fame will live on and that his own tomb (unlike that of Cynthia, which goes unnoticed) will become more famous than Achilles' (37–38). He goes on to dictate a whole series of *mandata* relating to her conduct at his funeral, expressed not hypothetically but as actual future events, and commands an epitaph that proclaims his fidelity (2. 13. 27–36):

tu uero nudum pectus lacerata sequeris	
nec fueris nomen lassa uocare meum	
osculaque in gelidis pones suprema labellis,	
cum dabitur Syrio munere plenus onyx.	30
deinde, ubi suppositus cinerem me fecerit ardor,	
accipiat manes paruula testa meos,	
et sit in exiguo laurus super addita busto	
quae tegat extincti funeris umbra locum,	
et duo sint uersus: "QVI NVNC IACET HORRIDA PVLVIS,	35
VNIUS HIC QVONDAM SERVVS AMORIS ERAT."	

As we will see in the discussion of 4. 7, the two attempted rejections of Cynthia are linked by a number of connections that make 4. 7 in many ways Cynthia's response to 2. 11 and 13. Finally, Propertius hints at resolving differences: The time to talk is now, not later, when his bones and *manes* will be incapable of speech (*sed frustra mutos reuocabis, Cynthia, manes: / nam mea quid poterunt ossa minuta loqui?* 57–58). These hints, together with his hope that Cynthia, though estranged, will mourn sincerely at his funeral, show further his desire for reconciliation.

A joyous miracle now dispels these morbid reflections. Propertius has experienced a happiness surpassing Agamemnon's at the fall of Troy, Odysseus' on his homecoming, Electra's when she saw the supposedly dead Orestes alive, Ariadne's when Theseus emerged from the labyrinth: He has slept with Cynthia (2. 14. 1–10). In the following lines he reveals the secret of this success (2. 14. 11–20):

at dum demissis supplex ceruicibus ibam,	
dicebar sicco uilior esse lacu:	
nec mihi iam fastus opponere quaerit iniquos	
nec mihi ploranti lenta sedere potest.	
atque utinam non tam sero mihi nota fuisset	15
condicio: cineri nunc medicina datur.	
ante pedes caecis lucebat semita nobis	
(scilicet insano nemo in amore uidet),	
hoc sensi prodesset magis: contemnite, amantes!	
sic hodie ueniet siqua negauit heri.	20

The tears which she is unable to resist (14) represent the mournful, self-pitying strains of 2. 13 (one might go so far as to suggest that that elegy, with its touching picture of Cynthia mourning the poet, was intended to produce precisely this effect); and "scorning" Cynthia—the technique that gets you into the bed of a woman who turned you down yesterday—is precisely what he did by rejecting her in 2. 10–11. I argue, therefore, that 2. 10–14 constitute a sequence in which Propertius first dismisses Cynthia and love poetry, then concedes that Amor (whether his emotional attachment to Cynthia or the god or both) prevents his breaking his commitment to either, and finally melts her resistance to achieve a sexual reconciliation which allows him to continue as a love poet. In the recapitulation of this sequence he will again reject Cynthia at the end of Book 3, his ability to write other kinds of poetry will again be at issue in Book 4 (especially 4. 1), and there will again be a sexual reconciliation (4. 8), but this time the new poetic direction, Callimachean aetiology, will be firmly within his reach and there will be no return to love poetry for Cynthia.

But all this lies in the future. For now, Propertius' joy endures all of one poem; 2. 15 concerns another night in Cynthia's arms, but with 2. 16 and the praetor from Illyria we are back to the bad old ways that prompted his recent rejection. The remaining elegies of Book 2 largely document the strained relationship, but two clearly programmatic poems require discussion here. Unfortunately, the text of both is so uncertain that we can do little more than guess at what they were intended to convey. In the first, 2. 30, Cynthia is invited to consort with Propertius among the haunts of the Muses (2. 30. 25–30):

mi nemo obiciat: libeat tibi, Cynthia, mecum	25
rorida muscosis antra tenere iugis.	
illic aspicias scopulis haerere Sorores	
et canere antiqui dulcia furta Iouis:	
ut Semela est combustus, ut est deperditus Io,	
denique ut ad Troiae tecta uolarit auis.	30

Whatever their connection with the earlier part of the poem (or rather, of what the manuscripts present as the poem), these lines are certainly relevant to the claims about enjoying the Muses' companionship that Propertius will make in 3. 1, 2, 3, and 5 as part of his later Callimachean aspirations (Callimachean poets of course are friends of the Muses; see Cameron [above, note 30] 128–29); since all kinds of poets can invoke the Muses' help, they do not necessarily hint at Callimachean poetry here, but do seem to suggest some kind of more serious, Muse-inspired verse different from his previous love poetry for Cynthia (the allusions in 29–30 to Jovian affairs perhaps indicate that Hellenistic erotic elegy, with its penchant for erotic myths, is on his mind). For now, however, Propertius will not join the goddesses unless Cynthia can come too (2. 30. 37–40):

hic ubi te⁸⁸ prima statuent in parte choreae
 et medius docta cuspide Bacchus erit,
 tum capiti sacros patiar pendere corymbos,
 nam sine te nostrum non ualet ingenium. 40

The combination of the Muses' mountain, a *chorea*, and the inspirational Bacchus may be intended to recall *Eclogues* 6 again, where Gallus on the mountain meets *Phoebe chorus* and Linus, but in any case the primacy of Cynthia in Propertius' poetry is again reasserted in terms reminiscent of 2. 1. He will not allow himself to be consecrated as a poet in this loftily pretentious company unless she is present, for without her *non ualet ingenium*, his "talent," necessary for whatever kind of poetry he writes, is powerless or worthless; in other words, whatever kind of poetry he will be writing that will lead to his consecration will still be Cynthia-poetry, presumably love elegy. However familiar that stance, there is nonetheless a new element of ambition here, directed not toward Ennian epic for Augustus but toward whatever Propertius would write as a friend of the Muses; only an undamaged text of the elegy would tell us exactly how this ambition is related to his association with the Muses in the opening of Book 3.

The last programmatic elegy is the group of lines commonly known as 2. 34. The Propertian archetype, however, presented the last 138 lines of Book 2 as a single elegy, and the decision to divide that mass here and only here is merely the conjecture of some anonymous fifteenth-century scholar that became canonized as a result of its acceptance in Beroaldus' edition (1487) and the first Aldine (1502); there is absolutely no reason to regard it as definitive. In any case 2. 34 as a whole is no more comprehensible than 2. 30; programmatic hints about abandoning or avoiding philosophy (27–28 and perhaps 29–30, if we knew who lies behind the manuscripts' *erechti* or *crechtei* or *crethei* in 29), epic (37–40), tragedy (41), natural science (51–54), and whatever lies behind the allusions in 33–36 proliferate in a chaos that cannot have been intended by Propertius himself. Some familiar themes do recur, however. For example, we find Amor as archer (as in 2. 12 and 13) and perhaps as inspirer of poetry in connection with Propertius as a poet of *ingenium* (2. 34. 55–60):

aspice me, cui parua domi fortuna relictæ est 55
 nullus et antiquo Marte triumphus aui,
 ut regnem mixtas inter conuiuia puellas
 hoc ego quo tibi nunc eleuor ingenio!
 me iuuat hesternis positum languere corollis
 quem tetigit iactu certus ad ossa deus. 60

In 2. 34. 31–32 Callimachus and Philotas are mentioned together for the first time as authors to be emulated:

⁸⁸ This is Guyet's generally accepted correction of the archetype's *me*.

tu satius memorem musis imitere Philitan⁸⁹
et non inflati Somnia Callimachi.

Much about this injunction is unclear. For example, if this is meant to be (as it is generally understood) a major programmatic statement about Propertius' own poetry, it is odd that he should express his supposed *credo* in the form of advice to another (advice, moreover, which he himself has yet to take) rather than in a personal manifesto, and odd that it should simply be dropped in here and not taken up by anything said later;⁹⁰ it is not even certain whether the command is meant to have a general validity or is contrasted only with the preceding two or four lines, that is, whether imitation of Philitas and Callimachus is supposed to be preferable to "the wisdom of Socratic books," knowledge of natural philosophy, and/or whatever "old man" is lurking in 29⁹¹ rather than to all other literary activities. It is also strange that Propertius should be giving such advice to Lynceus: Not only has he himself so far made no claim to be a Callimachean poet (the first hint of such a claim is reserved for 3. 1), but in 3. 3 he will express that claim through an imitation of the very "dream" mentioned here and will be wetted at the close with "the water of Philitas." The sequence would make more sense if Propertius in 3. 1-3 were acting upon counsel given to him here, and we are surely entitled to wonder whether this advice was not originally addressed to Propertius by some unknown figure rather than by Propertius to "Lynceus."

The end of Book 2 has suffered a particularly extreme disruption and does not even conclude with a complete sentence, but it is at least clear that Propertius ended the first book of the tribiblos with a declaration of pride in what he had achieved as poet thanks to his love-inspired *ingenium*, thus returning at the close to the theme with which he began (2. 34. 85-94):

haec quoque perfecto ludebat Iasone Varro 85
(Varro Leucadiae maxima flamma suae),
haec quoque lasciui cantarunt scripta Catulli
Lesbia quis ipsa notior est Helena,

⁸⁹ This is the form (certainly corrupt) in which the archetype presented the line (it also gave *inflatis omnia* in 32); Fedeli, for example, obelizes *satius* and *musis*. Since the transmitted accusative form *Philitan* and the principle of stylistic variation suggest that no work of Philitas was mentioned in 31, and since *musa* is well established in Propertius with the meaning "poetry" (above, note 74), the corruption probably lies in *memorem*, and perhaps in *satius* as well, which is normally construed with an infinitive (*OLD* s.v. "satis" 7). Camps' *tenuem* supplies an appropriate Hellenistic buzzword (applicable to the poet's proverbial thinness as well as balancing *non inflati* in 32), though *tenerum* (Hoeufft) is perhaps not impossible.

⁹⁰ Lines like 42-44, *ad molles membra resolue choros. / incipe iam angusto uersus includere torno / inque tuos ignes, dure poeta, ueni*, are too general to be regarded as a significant continuation.

⁹¹ 2. 34. 27-30 *quid tua Socraticis tibi nunc sapientia libris / proderit aut rerum dicere posse uias? / aut quid Erecthei tibi prosunt carmina lecta? / nil iuuat in magno uester amore senex*. The text is in any case highly suspect on account of the inelegant repetition *proderit ... prosunt*, with its pointless variation from future to present, as well as the crux in 29.

haec etiam docti confessa est pagina Calui
 cum caneret miserae funera Quintiliae,
 et modo formosa quam multa Lycoride Gallus
 mortuus inferna uulnera lauit aqua!
 Cynthia quin etiam⁹² uersu laudata Properti,
 hos inter si me ponere Fama uolet . . .

90

However exactly the catalogue of poets ended,⁹³ Propertius is clearly asserting for himself a place among his distinguished predecessors Varro, Catullus, Calvus, and Gallus, thus fulfilling the promise made in 2. 25. 3–4, with apologies to Calvus and Catullus, that Cynthia's *forma* would become *notissima* thanks to his poetry.⁹⁴

Having concluded the first book by establishing his rank among contemporary Roman writers, Propertius opens the second by seeking to define his place with respect to the Greek tradition. Those who take it for granted that Propertius was a self-consciously Callimachean poet throughout his work—despite the fact that nothing he wrote before Book 3 bears more than a passing resemblance in form or content or language to anything by Callimachus—often speak of Propertius declaring his Callimachean affiliation here,⁹⁵ but in fact, perhaps even more explicitly than in 2. 1, Propertius does not yet regard himself as a Callimachean poet (3. 1. 1–6):

Callimachi Manes et Coi sacra Philitae,
 in uestrum quaeso me sinite ire nemus!
 primus ego ingredior puro de fonte sacerdos
 Itala per Graios orgia ferre choros.
 dicite: quo pariter carmen tenuastis in antro,
 quoue pede ingressi, quamue bibistis aquam?

5

These lines have been subjected to various interpretations: that Propertius is approaching these poets as a priest conducting worship in their honour; that he comes hoping to receive such worship; that he comes as "a worshipper demanding an oracle."⁹⁶ But the most natural and obvious interpretation

⁹² Barber's *uiuet*, adopted by many editors, is a lame and obviously false stopgap.

⁹³ The prominence of *ingenium* in Book 2 and its connection with Cynthia invite speculation that, since the end of that book is manifestly corrupt and deficient, some of the lines about *ingenium* in 3. 2 (quoted below) might form the real ending of 2. 34. The analogy of the similarly structured *Amores* 1. 15 suggests that the lines about envy in 3. 1 might also have formed part of 2. 34; the matter is, however, too complex for discussion here.

⁹⁴ *Ista meis fiet notissima forma libellis, / Calue, tua uenia, pace, Catulle, tua.*

⁹⁵ So, for example, Fedeli on 3. 1. 1 speaks of "un' evidente dichiarazione di adesione poetica ai modelli invocati," while Ross 121 says that Propertius' "insistence on Callimachean poetics . . . is far more open, but it is only a question of degree—Callimachus had always been the accepted master" (even when he began the *Cynthia* with an imitation of Meleager?). Lyne 148 describes 3. 1–3 as "*retrospective*," an 'image' for Propertius the love poet, not a programme for such new poetry as there is in Book 3."

⁹⁶ G. Luck, "The Cave and the Source: On the Imagery of Propertius 3. 1. 1–6," *CQ* 7 (1957) 175–79. For the opening of Book 3, see also F. Quadlbauer, "Properz 3,1," *Philologus* 112 (1968) 83–118; R. J. Baker, "Propertius 3. 1. 1–6 Again: Intimations of Immortality?"

has been shunned because the assumption that Propertius is already a Callimachean poet makes it seem absurd: Propertius is in fact asking the Hellenistic masters how to write as they did because he now desires, for the first time, to imitate them formally.⁹⁷ The hints of sacral language here do not identify Propertius as a priest of Callimachus or of the Muses except insofar as such concepts serve as metaphors for the writing of poetry; Propertius the priest stands for Propertius the poet.⁹⁸ Far from identifying himself as a Callimachean poet, he is requesting instruction on how to become one: He is outside, not within, a grove that belongs to them and not to him (*uestrum*, not *nostrum*); he requests permission to enter (*sinite ire*) and asks how; and his questions, which concern matters of style (*tenuastis; quoue pede*) or inspiration (*quo . . . in antro; quamue bibistis aquam*), are absurd in the mouth of anyone who believes that he has already written two entire books of such poetry. Propertius' additional claim to be the first to attempt this enterprise (*primus ego ingredior*) drives these same commentators to further contortions, since he can hardly allege primacy if he means ordinary Latin love elegy such as Gallus and Tibullus wrote before him, but it is perfectly reasonable and comprehensible if he means the formal imitation or emulation of Hellenistic elegy in Latin, where his only surviving predecessor is Catullus 68. (Catullus 66 is a translation and therefore *nihil ad rem*.) Preconceptions about Propertius' relationship to Callimachus and Philotas have also affected the interpretation of *puro de fonte*, regularly construed with *sacerdos*, as in Camps' paraphrase, "first (of my race) I come, a priest (with water) from a spring that is pure and clear." It is more likely, however, that the phrase goes with *ferre* ("I am the first priest to attempt to bring Italian rites through Greek dances from the pure spring"), and that Propertius is claiming to be the first, as Camps puts it, to give "an Italian content to a literary form established by the Greeks," that is,

Mnem. 21 (1968) 35–39; W. R. Nethercut, "Propertius 3. 1. 1–6 Again," *Mnem.* 28 (1975) 73–75; D. P. Harmon, "The Poet's Initiation and the Sacerdotal Imagery of Propertius 3. 1–5," in *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History* 1, ed. by C. Deroux (Brussels 1979) 317–34; A. S. Hollis, "Heroic Honours for Philotas?" *ZPE* 110 (1996) 56–62.

⁹⁷ For an example, see Ross 113–14: "Is Propertius seeking admission to the grove of Callimachus and Philotas to offer worship, or to receive it himself after death, or to ask for an oracular response to certain questions? . . . Why does he ask information from Callimachus and Philotas about their sources of inspiration—has he not known before this? Above all, is he proclaiming a new beginning for his elegy at this point? or is he merely stating formally, or calling attention to, a poetic program he has always held?"

⁹⁸ For the poet as priest, see Hor. *Carm.* 3. 1. 3 *Musarum sacerdos* (and Ovid's parody at *Am.* 3. 8. 23 *Musarum purus Phoebique sacerdos*), Ov. *Tr.* 3. 2. 3–4 *nec . . . uestro / docta sacerdoti turba tulistis opus*; for poetry as worship, Virg. *G.* 2. 475–76 *Musae / quarum sacra fero*, Ov. *Tr.* 3. 5. 33 *tua sacra* (worship of Bacchus that is also poetry), Man. 1. 6 *hospita sacra ferens*, Mart. 7. 63. 5 *sacra Maronis* (opposed to *Ciceronis opus*), Stat. *S.* 5. 5. 3–4 *quae uestra, Sorores, / orgia, Pieriae, quas incestauimus aras?*, as well as the elaborate sacral-poetic imagery that opens Propertius' own 4. 6. The germ of the conceit is perhaps to be found in Hes. *Th.* 3–4 (quoted above), where the Muses dance around a spring and an altar of Zeus; in time the idea became cliché, so that even in prose one could speak of a "priest and worshipper" of literature (Sen. *Cons. ad Polyb.* 8. 2 *tunc te illae [sc. litterae] antistitem et cultorem suum uindicerent*).

to write Latin elegies in direct imitation of learned Hellenistic elegy. The two passages that provided Propertius' models here both refer to springs as sources of original poetry, Lucretius 1. 927–28 *iuuat integros accedere fontis / atque haurire* (cf. Propertius' *puro de fonte*) and Virgil, *Georgics* 2. 175 *ingredior sanctos ausus recludere fontis* (from which Propertius has derived his use of *ingredior* in the sense of *aggredior*). Lucretius and Virgil approach the springs; Propertius varies the image by representing himself as having already approached, so that he is now departing to present his new achievement to his readership.

That these aspirations of Propertius are in fact new and cannot be identified with the poetry he has written so far is still more clear in 3. 2. 1–2:

carminis interea nostri redeamus in orbem
gaudeat ut⁹⁹ solito tacta puella sono.

The Hellenistic ambitions are outside "the track of our song," to which Propertius must return from them, and they are not the "accustomed sound" in which Cynthia has delighted, which must be the earlier poetry in her name. Commentators say nothing about the important word *redeamus*; one cannot "return" without having first visited some other place, and the context shows that for Propertius that "other place" distinct from the poetry for Cynthia is the emulation of Callimachus and Philotas and their ilk. Far from being something basic to all his work, that emulation is probably a product of Propertius' patronage by Maecenas, and originated not in seeking a pose to avoid official "requests" for an epic conveyed through Maecenas, but rather from the association with Horace and especially Virgil that Maecenas' patronage offered. His relationship to the other members of Maecenas' great poetic triumvirate has often been represented as hostile,¹⁰⁰ but it would be better described as an amicable and creative *aemulatio*;¹⁰¹ as

⁹⁹ With Camps and Goold I prefer this Renaissance conjecture to *in*, the reading of the archetype; it provides a smoother connection between the two lines and also affirms that the poet returns purposefully from his Hellenistic ambitions to love poetry for Cynthia.

¹⁰⁰ See, for example, W. R. Nethercut, "The Irony of Propertius' 'Roman Elegies,' III. 1–5: Imitations of Horace and Vergil," *AJP* 91 (1970) 385–407, and, for Virgil in particular, Sullivan (above, note 7) 12–31.

¹⁰¹ Propertius' echoes of Virgil and Horace here have frequently been noted; in 3. 1. 4 he imitates Hor. *Carm.* 3. 30. 13–14 *Aeolium carmen ad Italos / deduxisse modos*. There is a humorous reflection of Propertius' ambitions in the notorious passage at Hor. *Ep.* 2. 2. 91–101, where Horace describes his competition in mutual admiration with another poet, plausibly identified as Propertius:

carmina compono, hic elegos, mirabile uisu caelatumque nouem Musis opus . . .	92
discedo Alcaeus puncto illius: ille meo quis? quis nisi Callimachus? si plus adposcere uisus, fit Mimnermus et optiuo cognomine crescit.	100

Rather than being evidence of a quarrel, this suggests friendly emulation, as Horace describes how each flatters the other by rating him the equal of his chief model; the unexpected joke about becoming Mimnermus, and that being more than becoming Callimachus, is a pleasant

Virgil aspired to be the Roman Theocritus, Hesiod, and Homer, as Horace aspired to be the Roman Alcaeus, so Propertius would become the Roman Callimachus.

But when Propertius does get "back on track" things are not what they were before. In Book 2, his *ingenium* was dependent upon a *puella* who created it and without whom it was worthless; now, however, it exists independently of her, to judge by 3. 2. 17–26:

fortunata meo siqua es celebrata libello:	
carmina erunt formae tot monumenta tuae.	
nam neque Pyramidum sumptus ad sidera ducti	
nec Iouis Elei caelum imitata domus	20
nec Mausolei diues fortuna sepulcri	
mortis ab extrema condicione uacant:	
aut illis flamma aut imber subducat honores,	
annorum aut tacito ¹⁰² pondere uicta ruent.	
at non ingenio quaesitum nomen ab aeuo	25
excidet: ingenio stat sine morte decus.	

Now *ingenium*, it seems, is independent of a specific *puella* who creates it; it can be applied by the poet to the service of whatever girl he chooses to celebrate with it, and it can bestow upon her beauty¹⁰³ a fame more enduring than that of the fabled Seven Wonders. This is not the only hint that Propertius is beginning to claim a kind of independence from Cynthia. Of course the very fact that he appeals to Callimachus and Philotas as authorities for instruction is a new departure. Instead of passively allowing Cynthia to create his *ingenium*, he requests help in shaping it according to a canonical set of aesthetic principles; one might say that he is seeking to acquire Callimachean *ars* with which to temper his *ingenium*. In addition, he begins to toy with the notion of inspiration by Apollo and Calliope, the very deities whose assistance he had disclaimed in 2. 1; though he only dreams their intervention, it turns out to determine the future course of his poetry, especially in Book 4. In a combination reminiscent of 2. 30, Propertius is now, though still in Cynthia's company, a friend of the Muses (3. 2. 15–16 *at Musae comites et carmina cara legenti / nec* [Baehrens: *et O*] *defessa choris Calliopeia meis*); he has been to see them on their mountain (3. 1. 17–18 *opus hoc de monte Sororum / detulit intacta pagina nostra uia*), and bids them crown him (3. 1. 19 *mollia, Pegasides, date*

jest that looks back from 3. 1. 1 to the monobiblos, where Mimnermus is the only predecessor held up for admiration (1. 9. 11). It is tempting to speculate that Horace is joking about Propertius becoming *Mimnermus Romanus* rather than *Callimachus Romanus*, but Rudd points out that 4. 1 was written after the epistle (*Horace. Epistles Book II and the Epistle to the Pisones* ['*Ars Poetica*'], ed. by N. Rudd [Cambridge 1989] 15); in fact the ambitions expressed in 3. 1–3 are pretentious enough to have inspired the jest.

¹⁰² Eldik's correction of the transmitted *ictu*.

¹⁰³ Camps and Fedeli interpret *decus* in 26 as the glory that Propertius wins from his poetry, but it surely means "beauty" here; the wonders of the world crumble, and the only everlasting *monumenta* are those created in poetry by *ingenium*.

uestro sarta poetae). Apollo guarantees his immortality (3. 1. 37–38 *ne mea contempto lapis indicet ossa sepulcro / prouisum est Lycio uota probante deo*) and, like Bacchus, is propitious to him (3. 2. 9 *nobis et Baccho et Apolline dextro*).

The programmatic elegies that begin Book 3 (3. 1–3) have so far been discussed as the manuscripts present them, as three independent poems, but in fact they seem to form a single long elegy bounded by the references to Philitas in its first and last lines (3. 1. 1 *Philitae*; 3. 3. 52 *Philitea*).¹⁰⁴ Luck (above, note 96) has noted that the questions asked in 3. 1. 5–6 seem to be answered in 3. 3: Apollo introduces Propertius to the cave of Callimachean poetry (cf. *quo . . . in antro*), Calliope anoints him with the water of Philitas (cf. *quamue bibistis aquam*). But the connections between 3. 3 on the one hand and 3. 1 and 2 on the other seem to go well beyond this. The rejection of martial poetry (3. 1. 7 *a ualeat, Phoebum quicumque moratur in armis*), which Propertius had been willing to embrace in 2. 1 and 2. 10 and indeed at the start of his dream in 3. 3, seems to reflect Apollo's and Calliope's injunction to shun epic. The reference to annals (3. 1. 15 *multi, Roma, tuas laudes annalibus addent*) has special point in light of Propertius' dream in 3. 3 of writing his own equivalent of Ennius' *Annales*. The visit to the mountain of the Muses, from which the poet has brought down his elegies (3. 1. 17–18, cited above), could reflect the encounter with Calliope and her sisters in 3. 3. The "untouched path" by which he came (3. 1. 18 *intacta . . . uia*) may recall the "new track" indicated by Apollo (3. 3. 26 *noua semita*). The *turba puellarum* that worships his words at 3. 2. 10 perhaps reflects Apollo's advice in 3. 3. 19–20 that Propertius should write *ut tuus in scamno iactetur saepe libellus / quem legat expectans sola puella uirum*. The purpose of this long poem is first (in "3. 1") to expound the new ambitions that will culminate in the Roman *Aetia* of Book 4, then (in "3. 3") to explain the origin of these ambitions. They began in a dream in which Propertius, reversing the stance of 2. 1, could at last write epic poetry, and indeed began an annalistic epic in imitation of Ennius, before Apollo and Calliope directed him away from epic back to elegy, and the latter moistened his lips with water from Philitas' spring (3. 3. 51–52 *lymphisque a fonte petitis / ora Philitea nostra rigauit aqua*), thus prompting the question asked of Callimachus and Philitas in 3. 1. 6, *quamue bibistis aquam*?

Propertius says that in this dream he was reclining upon Mt. Helicon and possessed what he denied in Book 2, namely the capacity to write epic (3. 3. 1–14):¹⁰⁵

¹⁰⁴ Many scholars and editors have accepted a combination of 1 and 2 (*interea* in 3. 2. 1, which is meaningless coming *ex abrupto* at the start of a poem, provides a powerful argument in favour), but the addition of 3 has not been proposed previously; it has, however, been suggested often that 3. 1–5 are all meant to be read together.

¹⁰⁵ *Hiscere* in 4 is generally interpreted as denying this capacity, but Propertius, like Ovid after him, has simply employed the verb in a well-attested archaic meaning (appropriate of

uisus eram molli recubans Heliconis in umbra	
Bellerophontei qua fluit umor equi	
reges, Alba, tuos et regum facta tuorum	
(tantum operis) neruis hiscere posse meis	
paruaque iam ¹⁰⁶ magnis admoram fontibus ora,	5
unde pater sitiens Ennius ante bibit,	
et cecini ¹⁰⁷ Curios fratres et Horatia pila	7
anseris et tutum uoce fuisse Iouem ¹⁰⁸	12
uictricesque moras Fabii pugnamque sinistram	9
Cannensem et uersos ad pia uota deos	10
Hannibalemque Lares Romana sede fugantis	11
regiaque Aemilia uecta tropaea rate,	8
cum me Castalia speculans ex arbore Phoebeus	13
sic ait aurata nixus ad antra lyra: . . .	

Since he was dreaming that he could at last write an epic, he accordingly began one extending from the origins of Rome to a point just after the death of Ennius (the triumph of L. Aemilius Paullus in 168 B.C.), an indication that he is intending not merely to rehash the *Annales* but to bring the chronicle up to his own time. Suddenly Apollo intervenes, with the full panoply of Callimachean imagery such as we have not seen before in Propertius (3. 3. 15–24):

"quid tibi cum tali, demens, est flumine? quis te	15
carminis heroi tangere iussit opus?	
non hic ulla tibi speranda est fama, Properti:	
molli sunt paruis prata terenda rotis	
ut tuus in scamno iactetur saepe libellus	

course to the Ennian context), "to speak"; for this, and for the remainder of this discussion of 3. 3 (including the adoption of *cecini* in 7 [for which see also below, note 107] and the transposition of 8 and 12), see J. L. Butrica, "Propertius and Ennius (3. 3. 7–12)," *CQ* 33 (1983) 464–68.

¹⁰⁶ A Renaissance correction of the transmitted *tam*.

¹⁰⁷ This early correction of *cecinit* is necessary for three reasons: First, Propertius cannot have attributed to the *Annales* an event it could not have contained (the triumph of L. Aemilius Paullus in 168, the year after Ennius' death); second, the subsequent development of the poem (especially Calliope's warning) is pointless if Propertius has not attempted to write an epic; third, if *cecinit* is read, Propertius devotes six lines to pointless elaboration of Ennius' name, and the warnings of Apollo and Calliope are equally pointless. Defenders of the paradoxos argue either that Propertius is deliberately inaccurate to show his incompetence in epic (contradicted by his assertion that in his dream he had such competence), that he did not know how the *Annales* ended (rather like a literate anglophone today not knowing how *Romeo and Juliet* turns out), or that he deliberately or even inadvertently included among the highlights of Roman history not a major victory or the triumph celebrating it but the transport by sea (*uecta* . . . rate 8) of the spoils from one of two minor military successes (either the victory of L. Aemilius Regillus over Antiochus' navy at Myonessus in 190 or the defeat of Demetrius of Pharos by L. Aemilius Paullus in 219)—all to save a *t* in one of the most extensively corrupted of ancient texts. For additional arguments in favour of the conjecture, see W. Kierdorf, "Cecini oder Cecinit? Überlegungen zum Text von Properz 3,3,7," *Hermes* 122 (1994) 368–72.

¹⁰⁸ Polster's transposition of 8 and 12, anticipated in Bibl. Vat. Chigi H. IV. 123, is required by the need for chronological order in Propertius' epic (an order preserved elsewhere in the summary and in Calliope's subsequent warning).

quem legat expectans sola puella uirum. 20
 cur tua praescriptos eucta est pagina gyros?
 non est ingenii cumba grauanda tui.
 alter remus aquas, alter tibi radat harenas,
 tutus eris: medio maxima turba mari est."

Having warned him away from epic, Apollo then shows him the way to a cavern (3. 3. 25–38):

dixerat, et plectro sedem mihi monstrat eburno 25
 qua noua muscoso semita facta solo est:
 hic erat affixis uiridis spelunca lapillis
 pendebantque cauis tympana pumicibus,
 orgia Musarum et Sileni patris imago
 fictilis et calami, Pan Tegeaeae, tui, 30
 et Veneris dominae uolucres, mea turba, columbae
 tingunt Gorgoneo punica rostra lacu,
 diuersaeque nouem sortitae iura Puellae
 exercent teneras in sua dona manus:
 haec hederas legit in thyrsos, haec carmina neruis 35
 aptat, at illa manu texit utraque rosam.
 e quarum numero me contigit una dearum
 (ut reor a facie, Calliopea fuit): . . .

Calliope approaches him; though Propertius coyly professes uncertainty about her identity, his words imply an etymology of her name (from καλή and ὄψ = ὄψις). She warns him against subjects from Roman history which follow on from those he sang before Apollo's intervention (Marius' victories against the Teutones in lines 43–44, a victory of 29 B.C. by C. Carrinas in 45–46), and, in contrast to Apollo, she couches her advice in terms not familiar from Callimachus; Propertius is to be "content with riding upon snow-white swans" in preference to the war-horse which symbolizes the martial themes of epic (3. 3. 39–40 *contentus niueis semper uectabere cynis, / nec te fortis equi ducet ad arma sonus*). What Propertius wrote before Apollo's intervention and the details of Calliope's prohibition together imply an epic encompassing the entire history of Rome from its origin right down to the present day. Of course such a poem would be monstrous in size and is, if anything, even more inconceivable than the Augustan epic proposed in 2. 1 and 2. 10; Ennius took sixteen books for his own *Annales*, but Propertius would have to include an additional 140 years of very eventful Roman history that included the Gracchi, the Mithridatic wars and their domestic consequences, the civil war of Caesar and Pompey, the triumviral period—to name only a few highlights. This dream of being the Augustan Ennius ends as Calliope redirects him toward erotic elegy and moistens his lips with the "water of Philitas" (3. 3. 47–52):

"quippe coronatos alienum ad limen amantis
 nocturnaeque canes ebria signa fugae,

ut per te clausas sciat excantare puellas
 qui uolet austeros arte ferire uiros."
 talia Calliope, lymphisque a fonte petitis
 ora Philitea nostra rigauit aqua.

50

The near-total loss of Hellenistic poetry, and especially of elegy (apart from some significant remains of Callimachus), makes all of this difficult to interpret. Scholarly concentration upon the relationship of Propertius to Callimachus has not been matched by a similar interest in his relationship to Philitas; this is perhaps understandable given the scarcity of fragments. Yet it is too infrequently observed that Callimachus alone is mentioned by Propertius only once (in 2. 1. 40; in 4. 1. 64, of course, the "Callimachus" is Propertius himself), while he is named or suggested in company with Philitas a total of five times (2. 34. 31–32; 3. 1. 1; 3. 3 [Philitas is named in 52; Callimachus is not named, but is implied by the imitation of his famous Dream]; 3. 9. 43–44; 4. 6. 3–4). This suggests that Propertius names Callimachus and Philitas here and elsewhere not so much in their own right as because they were recognized as the leading exponents of Hellenistic elegy, a role which they also play in Quintilian and which had probably been canonized long before Propertius. Propertius will become not *Philitas Romanus* but *Callimachus Romanus* in 4. 1 simply because he imitates the latter's *Aetia* rather than, say, the former's *Demeter*. The scene serves to reject implicitly the epic inclinations expressed in 2. 1 and 2. 10 (and still entertained at the start of the Dream) and to affirm a new ambition that Propertius can achieve while remaining an elegist, no longer in the Roman tradition, however, but as a follower and rival of Hellenistic masters. It is unclear what we should make of the *Philitea aqua* in an imitation of the *non inflati Somnia Callimachi*. It is tempting to suggest that Calliope's words about riding swans and the scenery of her warning, with its cave, Muses, instruments, and doves, recall a scene of poetic initiation that occurred in Philitas; this hypothetical scene might also have formed the basis for Propertius 2. 30, where there are *antra* on the *muscosis . . . iugis* (cf. *muscoso . . . solo* in 3. 3. 26) and the Sisters cling to the rocks, singing Jupiter's infatuations. At any rate, Propertius certainly seems to suggest imitation of both poets as representatives of a particular kind of learned elegy, though perhaps the allusion to Philitas when the whole context has led us to expect Callimachus is a joke to amuse him or us.¹⁰⁹ It is also not

¹⁰⁹ For an attempt to detect Philitean elements in 3. 3, see E. L. Bowie, "Theocritus' Seventh *Idyll*, Philetas and Longus," *CQ* 35 (1985) 67–91 (esp. 83–86), but the remains are far too exiguous for any firm conclusion. There is perhaps some programmatic significance in 3. 4 as well. The announcement of an imminent expedition against India (3. 4. 1 *arma deus Caesar dices meditatur ad Indos*) may recall 2. 10. 15 (*India quin, Auguste, tuo dat colla triumpho*); Propertius not only declines to participate but does not offer a poem on the campaign, as if acknowledging Calliope's advice, and his anticipation of the ensuing triumph is apparently another example of *uilia tura* in place of the greater offering, an actual description. There is certainly programmatic significance in 3. 5 (probably to be joined with 3. 4 as a single poem), an elegy frequently described as another *recusatio*, where Propertius again declares himself a

clear what we should make of what must be termed Apollo's and Calliope's gross ignorance of Propertius' poetry. In the first of two obviously parallel passages, the male Apollo defines Propertius' purpose from a female perspective, "so that your book is often tossed about upon a chair for a lonely girl to read it awaiting her man" (19–20); then the female Calliope defines it from a male perspective, "so that whoever desires to cheat strict husbands skillfully may know through you how to charm out sequestered girls" (49–50). Neither account seems appropriate either to what Propertius has already written or to what he writes later; his poetry will help no-one commit adultery, and his *querelae* are unlikely consolation for a woman nervously awaiting an assignation. Perhaps the failure of these conventional symbols of inspiration to describe Propertius' poetry accurately is meant to undercut their authority and should therefore be read in the light of his earlier denial that they inspired him.

The aforementioned loss of nearly all Hellenistic elegy, along with the lack of any single complete Hellenistic erotic elegy, also makes it difficult to judge how far Propertius follows through with this new ambition in Book 3 (in Book 4, of course, he will imitate the *Aetia*), but it seems likely that 11, 15, and 19 at least imitate the form of Hellenistic erotic elegy and thus qualify as specimens of Propertius' desire to rival "Callimachus and Philotas" if these are taken as the canonized representatives of all Hellenistic elegy.¹¹⁰ In other respects too the poet is following new directions distinct from Book 2, and various explanations have been advanced to account for the new manner; some speak of weariness and forced effort, others of an experimental phase or loss of poetic direction.¹¹¹ But the change, which I would argue is deliberate and premeditated, has two principal causes: to suggest Propertius' striving toward imitation of Callimachus and Philotas,

companion of the Muses (19–20 *me iuuat in prima coluisse Helicon iuuenta / Musarumque choris implicuisse manus*) and expresses the hope (25 *tum mihi . . . libeat*) that in old age (23–24 *ubi iam Venerem grauis interceperit aetas / sparserit et nigras alba senecta comas*) he will turn to natural philosophy as a subject (25–46). Scholars have been too busy citing the parallel with Virgil to notice the echo of 2. 34. 51–54, in which similar topics (the lunar eclipse 52; life after death 53; thunder and lightning 54) are rejected because no girl *solet rationem quaerere mundi* (51).

¹¹⁰ Francis Cairns has argued convincingly that the mythological component of Hellenistic elegy—the only part that has survived, in most cases (Hermesianax, Alexander Aetolus, Phanocles)—was embedded within an at least nominally personal frame, thus producing the kind of form observed in these elegies; cf. *Tibullus: A Hellenistic Poet at Rome* (Cambridge 1979) 214–30. For an attempt to confirm this hypothesis from the papyrus fragments, see J. L. Butrica, "Hellenistic Erotic Elegy: The Evidence of the Papyri," *PLLS* 9 (1996) 297–321, and for Propertius 3. 15 as an imitation of Hellenistic elegy, see J. L. Butrica, "Myth and Meaning in Propertius 3. 15," *Phoenix* 48 (1994) 135–51. Neither Callimachus nor Philotas is known to have written in this form, but it should be emphasized again that they are named here not as specific objects of imitation but simply as the canonized representatives of Hellenistic elegy.

¹¹¹ So, for example, Hubbard 71: "Much of the book has an investigatory air and the poet seems to be exploring his own capacities and trying to define what he took poetry to be"; 89: "Mostly, they show an exhaustion of the genre, and give the impression that the poet is bored with love poetry and trying, though as yet unsuccessfully, to find new modes"; Camps (Book 3) 2: "Hence it is clear that in this Book the author is no lover in search of a means of expression, but a poet in search of subjects."

and to prepare for the second attempted break with Cynthia by expressing the poet's difficulties and dissatisfaction. The erotic poems of Book 3 are nearly all imbued with bitterness, frustration, or disappointment, and several have parallels in Ovid's *Remedia Amoris*: Two quarrels in 6 and 8 are followed by a confession of shameful dependence in 11 and a general denunciation of feminine venality in 13; in 14 the poet's longing for conditions which would make Roman women readily accessible implies dissatisfaction with Cynthia that incites his interest in these other women; 15 warns her against jealousy and suspicion, 19 against *libido*; in 16 he debates whether to risk his life travelling to Tivoli at her summons (a technique recommended by Ovid for falling out of love);¹¹² in 17 he prays to Bacchus for release from what he now calls a "disease"; in 20 he seeks a new attachment to drive out the old, and in 21 he proposes travel as a further means of escape, two more techniques with the Ovidian seal of approval.¹¹³ The only "happy" love poem, 3. 10, is a fantasy of wishful thinking, not a purported record of experience; ironically, Propertius tells Cynthia here to pray that her domination of him will continue forever,¹¹⁴ even as he is preparing to challenge it. Many of these "erotic" elegies also contain explicit or implicit hints of new poetic directions: 7 and 16 have significant links to epigram; 12 draws upon Hellenistic scholarly and literary traditions to create a miniature *Odyssey*; 11, 15, and 19 evince an interest in Hellenistic erotic elegy; 17 promises dithyrambs in exchange for release;¹¹⁵ 21 implies comedy or rhetoric as alternatives;¹¹⁶ and the love affair that in Book 2 was an epic experience on a par with Achilles' or Helen's is now, in 6, cast within a form that self-consciously recreates a scene from a comedy.¹¹⁷ Propertius' apparent uncertainty of direction is deliberate, for this is the transitional phase between the spontaneous Cynthia-poet and the artful Roman Callimachus.

Propertius deals explicitly with the future course of his poetry in 3. 9,¹¹⁸ which marks the beginning of the second half of the tribiblos. The

¹¹² Ov. *Rem.* 520 *est data nox: dubita nocte uenire data.*

¹¹³ Ov. *Rem.* 484 *posita est cura cura repulsa noua*; 214 *i procul et longas carpere perge uias.*

¹¹⁴ 3. 10. 17–18 *et pete, qua polles, ut sit tibi forma perennis / inque meum semper stent tua regna caput.*

¹¹⁵ 3. 17. 39–40 *haec ego non humili referam memoranda cothurno, / qualis Pindarico spiritus ore tonat.*

¹¹⁶ 3. 21. 27–28 *persequar aut studium linguae, Demosthenis arma, / libaboque* (Suringar: *librorumque* O) *tuos, †doctē Menandre, sales.*

¹¹⁷ For this feature, see J. L. Butrica, "Propertius 3. 6," *EMC* 27 (1983) 17–37. I hope to argue elsewhere that 14, commending the Lycurgan institution of women's exercise at Sparta for opening the way to free love, is an imitation with reversal of a monologue from the *Adelphoe* of Philemon, where Solon's institution of public brothels is commended for upholding public decency.

¹¹⁸ For earlier interpretations of this difficult poem, see Wimmel 250–59; A. W. Bennett, "The Patron and Poetical Inspiration: Propertius 3.9," *Hermes* 95 (1967) 222–43; Hubbard 109–15; Gold, "Propertius 3. 9"; Gold, *Literary Patronage* 163–72; Ross 123–24.

opening seems to be a response to some specific theme or project proposed by Maecenas which Propertius declares beyond his capacity; his nautical imagery (cf. 3. 3. 15 and 22–24) shows that he has absorbed Apollo's lesson (3. 9. 1–4, 35–36):

Maecenas, eques Etrusco de sanguine regum,
 infra¹¹⁹ fortunam qui cupis esse tuam,
 quid me scribendi tam uastum mittis in aequor?
 non sunt apta meae grandia uela rati.

...

non ego uelifera tumidum mare findo carina:¹²⁰ 35
 tota sub exiguo flumine nostra mora est.

Whatever Maecenas proposed is left unspecified, but the great sea and the large sails required to cross it suggest the epic poetry which was pledged conditionally in 2. 1 and 2. 10 before being rejected decisively in response to the dream of 3. 3. Propertius manages to evoke both earlier phases of his ambition by again rejecting mythological epics like *Thebais* and *Iliads* precisely as he did at 2. 1. 21 and by again affirming his ambition to emulate Callimachus and Philitas, even to the extent of becoming an object of cult, as Apollo and Calliope suggested in 3. 3 (3. 9. 37–46):

non flebo in cineres arcem sedisse paternos
 Cadmi nec septem¹²¹ proelia clade pari,
 nec referam Sca eas et Pergama, Apollinis arces,
 et Danaum decimo uere redisse ratis 40
 moenia cum Graio Neptunia pressit aratro
 uictor Palladiae ligneus artis equus:
 inter Callimachi sat erit placuisse libellos
 et cecinisse modis, Coe¹²² poeta, tuis.
 haec urant pueros, haec urant scripta puellas 45
 meque deum clament et mihi sacra ferant!

The striking novelty here is that Propertius now pledges himself without disqualification to pursue under Maecenas' guidance a series of topics that

¹¹⁹ Livineius' correction of the transmitted *intra*; as a descendant of kings who prefers to live as a comparatively more humble equestrian, Maecenas is clearly living "beneath," not "within," his royal *fortuna*.

¹²⁰ The failure of N to include this line has stirred unmerited suspicion; in any case, even if it should be an interpolation, it obviously represents the sort of thing that Propertius intended to say in the context.

¹²¹ Lipsius' correction of the transmitted *semper*.

¹²² Beroaldus' almost universally accepted correction of the manuscripts' *dure*. Recently A. Allen, "*Propertius inter libellos* . . . (3,9,43 f.)," *Hermes* 123 (1995) 377–79 has proposed the implausibly affectionate *care* in a second supposed allusion to Callimachus, but the frequency with which Propertius pairs Callimachus and Philitas tells against his suggestion, which would destroy an apparently deliberate reference back to the opening lines of Book 3. There is a good parallel for these lines as emended by Beroaldus in 4. 6. 3–4 *serta Philiteis certet Romana corymbis / et Cyrenaeas urna ministret aquas*; like Callimachus here, Philitas is identified through his name (in an adjectival derivative), while Callimachus, like Philitas here, is identified through the geographical epithet *Cyrenaeus* (cf. *Cous* here).

partake not only of epic themes earlier deemed acceptable (though recognized as impossible) but also of themes which he had explicitly rejected (3. 9. 47–56):

te duce uel Iouis arma canam caeloque minantem	
Coeum et Phlegraeis Eurymedonta iugis,	
eductosque pares siluestri ex ubere reges ¹²³	51
ordiar et caeso moenia firma Remo	50
celsaque Romanis decerpta Palatia tauris,	49
crescet et ingenium sub tua iussa meum:	52
prosequar et currus utroque ab litore ouantis,	
Parthorum astutae tela remissa fugae	
claustraque Pelusi Romano subruta ferro	55
Antonique grauis in sua fata manus.	

This pledge seems indisputably genuine; though the verbs are largely ambiguous and most might be present subjunctive in a sort of condition with *te duce* ("should you lead the way I might essay these topics"), *crescet* in 52 (which Camps would emend to *crescat*) seems to guarantee that all are future indicative; thus *te duce* is not a challenge to the lyric poet Maecenas to treat such themes himself, but means simply that Propertius will treat them under Maecenas' patronage (but see below for a further interpretation of *te duce*). Again the poet's *ingenium* is engaged (52); no longer the creation of Cynthia, it is now wholly free to grow (cf. *crescet*) and develop as the poet applies it to new challenges. Somewhat surprisingly, the subjects indicated here include a *Gigantomachy* and the origins of Rome, two themes which Propertius in 2. 1. 39–40 and 23–24 said that he would not treat even if he had the capacity. Of course the latter would inevitably have formed part of the dream-epic begun in 3. 3, and it adumbrates the aetiological poetry eventually essayed in Book 4; the more puzzling *Gigantomachy* is surely to be explained through the potential of such a subject for political allegory¹²⁴ (and note also that the use of the epithet *Phlegraeus* inevitably recalls the explicitly Callimachean disavowal in 2. 1. 35). The other subjects here approved are less unexpected: They include a triumph, a Parthian war, the capture of Pelusium, and the suicide of Antony, all falling within the *bellaque resque Caesaris* promised in 2. 1, with the last two specifically from the Egyptian campaign featured so prominently in 2. 1. 31–34.

The situation is a consciously paradoxical one: Propertius emphatically declares his ambition to be a Callimachean (and Philitean) poet, but conditionally pledges himself to some seemingly unCallimachean subjects

¹²³ With Goold I have adopted Peiper's transposition of 49 and 51 to preserve the chronological order demanded by the sequence implied by *ordiar* (50) and *prosequar* (53). The similar endings *iugis* (48) and *reges* (51) could have caused an omission of 51 that led to the disruption.

¹²⁴ For the possible political implications of a *Gigantomachy*, see P. R. Hardie, *Virgil's Aeneid: Cosmos and Imperium* (Oxford 1986) 83–90, esp. 87 n. 8 on this elegy.

that ought normally to lie within the scope of epic. The paradox will be resolved in Book 4, when Callimachean aetiological elegy becomes the medium for commemorating both the origins of Rome and the victories of Caesar.¹²⁵ It is perhaps here that the true meaning of the disputed phrase *te duce* should be sought;¹²⁶ rather than a neutral "under your patronage," or a taunt, as Gold would have it, it could mean "following your example." Propertius portrays Maecenas as a man who has access to great power and wealth but either declines them or exercises them with modesty and restraint, and states explicitly that his avoidance of epic is based upon Maecenas' own example (3. 9. 21–30):

haec¹²⁷ tua, Maecenas, uitae praecepta recepi,
 conor¹²⁸ et exemplis te superare tuis.
 cum tibi Romano dominas in honore securis
 et liceat medio ponere iura Foro
 uel †tibi† Medorum pugnaces ire per hastas 25
 atque ornare¹²⁹ tuam fixa per arma domum
 et tibi ad effectum uires det Caesar, et omni
 tempore tam faciles insinuentur opes,
 parcis, et in tenuis humilem te colligis umbras:
 uelorum plenos subtrahis ipse sinus. 30

The nautical image in 29–30 (specifically the ship under sail) recalls the poem's opening and thus establishes a parallel between Propertius and Maecenas: The latter withdraws his sails in order not to be conqueror and magistrate, the former lacks the large sails required to accomplish Maecenas' behest. In pledging himself to ostensibly epic subjects while declaring his aim to imitate Callimachus and Philitas (again as the representatives of learned Hellenistic elegy), Propertius suggests that he will be a sort of Maecenas of poetry: Just as Maecenas declines to exercise power openly and prefers to remain *humilis* within shadows that are *tenuēs*, so Propertius will treat his mighty epic subjects in a modest Callimachean manner.

In the meantime, however, he offers an interesting anticipation of 4. 6 in 3. 11, the first of his two major Actium elegies. The form—a personal frame (1–26, 71–72) surrounding a bulky mythological section—suggests the probable form of Hellenistic erotic elegy, and so we may see here a

¹²⁵ For 3. 9 as an anticipation of Book 4, see Hubbard 113–14.

¹²⁶ Gold, "Propertius 3. 9" 108–9 overinterprets *te duce* by glossing it, "if you will give me inspiration by leading the way and doing it yourself," and says that it suggests, "if Maecenas alters his political aspirations," or that "Maecenas might want to take up epic or panegyric poetry." A different kind of overinterpretation is offered by Bennet (above, note 118), who suggests that the phrase implies a "numinous power" for Maecenas.

¹²⁷ This, Baehrens' correction of the transmitted *at*, refers to the commonplaces which Propertius has been spouting since line 5 and thus provides a significantly better connection to the context.

¹²⁸ Heinsius' and Broekhuizen's correction of the senseless *cogor*.

¹²⁹ A Renaissance correction (now attributed to Dempster) of the pointless *onerare*.

partial realization of Propertius' ambition to emulate Philotas at least, if not Callimachus. (Callimachus of course composed no "personal" erotic elegies; it is less certain that Philotas did not.) One daring innovation is the assimilation of recent history to Greek mythology, as a series of legendary heroines (Medea, Penthesilea, Omphale, the barely historical Semiramis) is capped by the real-life Cleopatra. Doubts about the seriousness or pro-Augustan stance of the poem¹³⁰ are removed when its rhetorical strategy—the exaltation of Octavian's *pudor* and self-control in contrast not only to Antony but even to the gods themselves—is appreciated. Propertius first introduces a series of male figures dominated by or weaker than various females; thus he leads us to expect, when Cleopatra is introduced, that she will be shown dominating her male companion Antony. Instead, Antony is suppressed (in conformity of course with "the official version"), and Cleopatra is coupled with Octavian; but instead of succumbing like his predecessor, he proved to be the only male with enough self-control to resist and dominate her. (Propertius surely has in mind the anecdote reported at Dio 51. 12 about the interview between the two before her death, when Octavian kept his eyes fixed upon the ground during Cleopatra's passionate appeals.) The poem thus contains a sincere encomium of Octavian's moral strength, contrasted with Propertius' own weakness; this is embodied not in an historical epic but in a nominally personal context within an explicitly erotic elegy (cf. 3. 11. 1–4), the only kind of poetry that Propertius can write as yet, though a more ambitious kind involving the emulation of Greek masters.

The farewell to Cynthia that concludes Book 3 has regularly been interpreted as the end of the affair,¹³¹ and a sense of closure is indeed created by numerous reminiscences of the *Cynthia* and especially of its opening elegy (for these, see Fedeli's introductory note on 3. 24 + 25, with literature); again, however, as in 2. 10 + 11, Propertius is only simulating closure as part of "ending" the affair. But the attentive reader of what has preceded must sense that this is anything but an end. Throughout Book 2 Propertius emphasised that his talent was dependent upon its creator Cynthia, and in Books 2 and 3 he considered, then declined, possible alternatives to Cynthia-poetry; but at the end of 3 he has dismissed Cynthia without proposing anything to take her place. Thus the close of Book 3, like the end of an episode of a serial or soap opera, is an old-fashioned "cliffhanger" that generates suspense about what will happen next. In this case we are to wonder first whether Propertius can really write at all without the woman on whom his *ingenium* depended, and second what kind of poetry it will be, historical epic (as canvassed in 2. 1, 2. 10, and 3. 3),

¹³⁰ See, for example, W. Nethercut, "Propertius 3.11," *TAPA* 102 (1971) 411–43, with literature, and, most recently, Gural (above, note 50) 191–208.

¹³¹ Camps (Book 3) 165: "The poet declares that he is free at last from the servitude of his love for Cynthia"; Fedeli 675: "3,24 rappresenta l'addio all'amore e alla poesia d'amore."

emulation of learned Hellenistic elegy (as in 3. 1–3), or the combination of epic themes and Hellenistic elegiac style implied by 3. 9. It is no coincidence that these are the very themes treated in 4. 1: Fulfilling the promise of 3. 9, Propertius proposes to write Callimachean aetiological elegy on the origins of Rome (and is already offering etymologies and drawing the contrast between past and present essential to such an effort), but Horos interrupts mid-stream objecting that his dependence upon Cynthia dooms this project to failure.

With this rejection of Cynthia in 3. 24–25 begins the second cycle of rejection and reconciliation, paralleling 2. 10–14. When he abandoned Cynthia in 2. 10, Propertius stated a poetic alternative that he knew lay beyond his capacity, then quickly retreated; this time he feels confident enough to plunge headlong into the new project and announces his intention to write aetiological poetry even while writing it (4. 1. 61–70):¹³²

Ennius hirsuta cingat sua dicta corona:
 mi folia ex hedera porrige, Bacche, tua
 ut nostris tumefacta superbiat Vmbria libris,
 Vmbria Romani patria Callimachi.
 scandentis quisquis cernit de uallibus arces
 ingenio muros aestimet ille meo. 65
 Roma, faue: tibi surgit opus. date candida, ciues,
 omina et inceptis dextera cantet ausi.
 sacra diesque canam et cognomina prisca locorum:
 has meus ad metas sudet oportet equus. 70

The openings of the two previous books have introduced Ennius and Callimachus respectively as implied or stated models for an alternative to Cynthia-poetry; here at last we have Propertius' own conscious and decisive rejection of Ennius in favour of Callimachus. (In 3. 3, of course, he represented himself as having only dreamed the advice of Apollo and Calliope.) Newly empowered by his "discovery" of Callimachean artistry, Propertius can now do several things that in 2. 1, at the beginning of his poetic development, he rejected as impossible. In 2. 1. 41–42 he denied the capacity *Caesaris in Phrygios condere nomen auos*; but that is what he seems to be doing in the first, "vatic" half of 4. 1 on Rome's Trojan origins (note especially 48 *felix terra tuos cepit, Iule, deos*). Rome's origins were also rejected (2. 1. 23 *regnaue prima Remi*), but they are an inevitable part of the intended aetiological work. This choice of subject matter fulfills the pledge made in 3. 9 to celebrate the origins of Rome, while the choice of manner and genre fulfills the ambitions expressed in 3. 1 to enter the grove of Callimachus and Philotas and those expressed in 3. 9 to be read alongside their works. Only now, by carrying out this programme, will Propertius become *Callimachus Romanus*, and even this limited claim is immediately

¹³² For aetiological elements early in the elegy, note especially 4. 1. 35 *Alba potens, albae suis omine nata*.

challenged by Horos, who voices a question that should occur to every reader: Can the Cynthia-poet really write poetry, especially of such a difficult and ambitious nature,¹³³ without her inspiration? It has long troubled scholars that 4. 1 proposes a new direction for Propertius' poetry, then immediately declares it doomed to failure.¹³⁴ The most widely accepted view seems to be that Horos' warning does not cancel out Propertius' ambition but simply explains the combination of aetiological and erotic poetry that the book in fact contains. But one hardly imagines that Propertius would write a poem of 150 lines (his longest, in fact) merely to explain the disparate contents of a poetic miscellany. Scholars have failed to find the "answer" to the question posed by 4. 1 for the simple reason that Propertius deliberately avoids giving one. In this he characteristically differs from Ovid, who offers a neat and tidy resolution in a similar situation at *Amores* 3. 1; Elegy and Tragedy wrangle over his future course until Tragedy grants him a little time to finish with Elegy before he advances to the nobler form. Propertius, Ovid's model here as so often in the *Amores*, leaves unresolved the question of whether his new poetic endeavour can succeed despite Horos' objections and allows the answer to emerge from the remainder of the book, where aetiological and erotic themes compete. Whether or not the erotic elements that appear even in some of the aetiological poems should be regarded in the light of Horos' warning, Cynthia does return, as if against the poet's will, only to be banished forever from his poetry, though not from his bed.

As Book 4 continues, Propertius seems at first to be winning the battle; 4. 2 is apparently a straightforward aetiological poem on a statue of the Etruscan god Vertumnus, though its emphasis upon changeability and disguise should leave us wondering whether the entire book will not display a Vertumnan versatility. The next elegy is a departure for Propertius, an entire poem written in the character of another person, a young Roman wife whose husband is absent on campaign. Arethusa's letter, a part of Propertius' exploration of marital love, is meant to be contrasted principally

¹³³ Not to mention dry and academic—the ancients were in no doubt that the poetry of the *Cynthia* and the poetry of the *Aetia* were worlds apart; for unromantic assessments of Callimachus' work, see *AP* 11. 321 and 322, and especially *Mart.* 10. 4. 7–12, which asserts the essential humanity and reality of Martial's own poetry in opposition to the *Aetia*:

quid te uana iuuant miserae ludibria chartae?
hoc lege quod possit dicere Vita, "meum est."
non hic Centauros, non Gorgonas Harpyiasque
inuenies: hominem pagina nostra sapit.
sed non uis, Mamurra, tuos cognoscere mores
nec te scire: legas *Aetia* Callimachi.

10

This is one more reason why there is very little chance that M. Puelma is right in suggesting that Roman love elegy could have been modelled after the *Aetia*; see "Die Aitien des Kallimachos als Vorbild der römischen Amores-Elegie," *MH* 39 (1982) 285–304 and the Italian version, "Gli *Aetia* di Callimaco come modello dell'elegia romana d'amore," *A&R* 28 (1983) 113–22.

¹³⁴ The best account of 4. 1 is C. W. Macleod, "Propertius 4.1," *PLLS* (1976) 141–53.

with the characterizations of Cynthia and Cornelia, but it is not entirely out of place in a Roman *Aetia*; two passages are replete with references to religious customs (13–18, 57–62), and the story of Acontius and Cydippe shows that inherently erotic episodes with limited aetiological content had a place in Callimachus' own *Aetia* and indeed could win for it a certain reputation as erotic poetry.¹³⁵ The fourth elegy, on the name of the Mons Tarpeius, is aetiological in form but erotic in content, a blend of the book's two currents. With 4. 5, however, we seem to return for the first time to the poet's own love-life. The elegy begins with Propertius vehemently denouncing the *lena* Acanthis, who has allegedly plied love-charms against him and who is depicted instructing a young woman; it ends with his exultation over her sordid death. Only in 63 does Propertius identify her pupil as *amica nostra*.¹³⁶ In Book 2 or 3 this would automatically be taken as Cynthia (both Propertius and Cynthia have been depicted using the word to define her relationship to him);¹³⁷ but can it still signify Cynthia after the rejection that concluded Book 3? Or is this a fulfillment of Horos' warning: Is Cynthia again, or still, his *amica*?

The resolution of these questions is postponed while Propertius makes an emphatic demonstration of both his independence from her and his new stylistic ambitions in the aetiological elegy 4. 6. This, Propertius' most self-consciously ambitious work,¹³⁸ fulfills promises and aspirations expressed since 2. 1. It is explicitly presented as written in the manner of Callimachus and Philitas, thus fulfilling the ambitions expressed in 3. 1.¹³⁹ In addition, it is a celebration of the Actian victory, promised or implied as

¹³⁵ Hutchinson offers some suggestive arguments for the relationship of 4. 3 to the rest of Book 4 in what is perhaps the best account to date of the unity of Book 4. For the *Aetia* as, at least in part, an erotic poem, see *Ov. Rem.* 381–82 *Callimachi numeris non est dicendus Achilles, / Cydippe non est oris, Homere, tui*; it can be argued, however, that Ovid is thinking only of the Acontius and Cydippe episode and not the *Aetia* as a whole (Acontius' wooing of Cydippe is a love story, after all). The injunctions at *Ars* 3. 329 to know the poetry of Callimachus and Philitas and at *Rem.* 759–60 to avoid them surely refer to epigrams rather than to the *Aetia*, but the apparent characterization of Callimachus as an erotic poet could be meant to characterize Ovid as an erotomane who seizes upon the few erotic episodes in the *Aetia* to characterize the entire work as erotic (of course he has a rather different motive for claiming in *Tristia* 2 that the whole of Greek and Latin literature is saturated with sex).

¹³⁶ 4. 5. 63 *his animum nostrae dum uersat Acanthis amicae*.

¹³⁷ He uses it of her at 2. 6. 42 *semper amica mihi* and 2. 30. 23 *una contentum pudeat me uiuere amica*; she calls herself his *amica* at 2. 29. 31 *"quid tu matutinus"* ait *"speculator amicae?"*

¹³⁸ After decades of unsympathetic misinterpretation initiated by Gordon Williams' dismissal of it in *Tradition and Originality*, the tide seems to be turning; notable recent discussions include R. J. Baker, *"Caesaris in nomen"* (Propertius IV, vi), *RhM* 126 (1983) 153–74; F. Cairns, "Propertius and the Battle of Actium," in *Poetry and Politics in the Age of Augustus*, ed. by D. West and A. Woodman (Cambridge 1984) 129–69; B. Arkin, "Language in Propertius 4. 6," *Philologus* 133 (1989) 246–51; and G. Mader, "Poetry and Propaganda in Propertius 4. 6," *WS* 102 (1989) 141–47. The recent discussion by Gurval (above, note 50) 249–78 represents a step backwards in appreciation of the poem.

¹³⁹ 4. 6. 3–4 *serta* (Scaliger: *cera* O) *Philiteis certet Romana corymbis / et Cyrenaeas urna ministret aquas*. *Cera* has been defended as an acceptable symbol of literary effort, but surely the contrast with Philitas' ivy berries requires another vegetal image.

a theme in 2. 1, 3. 3, and 3. 9. Finally (and appropriately for a work that accomplishes the difficult task of accommodating epic subject matter within the style of Hellenistic learned elegy), it reverses 2. 1. 3 completely, and asserts unambiguously that Propertius does enjoy the inspiration of Apollo and Calliope and is therefore not dependent upon Cynthia; as the only poem in which Propertius invokes the aid of Calliope, it suggests a full conversion from a "natural" poet to a conventionally Muse-inspired one.¹⁴⁰ For Propertius to celebrate the victories of Augustus seemed unlikely as long as he remained an elegist, since such victories belong to epic hexameters, not to elegiac couplets; but Callimachean aetiological elegy has at last provided a way for him to accommodate the subject matter within a form and a style compatible with his status as elegist by incorporating it within an *aiton* on Apollo's temple on the Palatine. Just as he had implied in 3. 9, he has both celebrated the *bellaque resque* of Augustus and emulated Callimachus.

Whether or not Cynthia was the *amica* of 4. 5, she certainly returns to Propertius' poetry in 4. 7 and 8. Her spectacular re-emergence constitutes one of the enduring interpretive puzzles of the Propertian corpus, not only for itself but also for the curious fact that, though she is a singed spectre from beyond the grave in 7, in 8 she is a living, breathing Fury. Her reappearance is obviously awkward if 3. 25 is regarded as the end of the affair, but in a linear reading of the tribiblos it can be interpreted as illustrating Horos' warning that she still dominates the poet. And her transition from death to life, which caused Postgate such consternation,¹⁴¹ is less puzzling if the poems are read as programmatic,¹⁴² rather than autobiographical, and in the terms both of Horos' warning and of the poet-dominant relationship, especially as seen in 2. 11 and 13 and in 3. 2. In Book 2 Cynthia created Propertius' talent, and both won fame through it; the "terms" of their relationship were that her gifts inspired him, while the poetry that he created from them immortalized both poet and mistress as only *ingenium* can—Martial surely recognized this when he said in 14. 189 that Cynthia "received fame and bestowed no less herself." The first attempt at rejecting Cynthia in 2. 11 was expressed in a quasi-epigram that stripped away her identity and warned that she would be dead and forgotten without his poetry; at the same time, however, Propertius asserted in 2. 13 that his own fame, by contrast, would indeed live on. The situation of 4. 7 reflects the terms of Cynthia's rejection in 2. 11: The funeral pyre has

¹⁴⁰ 4. 6. 11–12 *Musa, Palatini referemus Apollinis aedem: / res est, Calliope, digna fauore tuo*. Contrast the failed invocation of the Pierides at 2. 10. 12, when Propertius professes his unfulfilled determination to write epics on Augustus' conquests.

¹⁴¹ J. P. Postgate, *Select Elegies of Propertius* (London 1884) lv: "If viii. had preceded vii., the contrast would have been startling enough. . . . But to reverse the order and to bid nature revolve upon her track is a ghastly imagination, or rather Mephistophelian mockery, only possible to ages which have learnt to finger the secret springs of the horrible and produced the painting of a Wiertz and the fiction of a Poe."

¹⁴² The programmatic reading is encouraged and justified by the emphasis placed upon Cynthia as a figure of inspiration in 2. 1. 3–4.

indeed taken away her *munera*, and she has no tomb or epitaph for the world to notice. As we shall see below, Cynthia has come back to reclaim the fame that Propertius has tried to strip from her: She orders the construction of a monument to ensure the fame that he sought to deny her and furnishes it with an epitaph of her own devising, while seeking to strip away his own fame by commanding the destruction of the poetry in her honour that brought him that renown. After the first rejection it was Propertius who relapsed and begged Amor for mercy; this time it is the rejected Cynthia who forces her way back into his poetry, and her return from death to invade his sleep is an effective metaphor for her intrusion into his consciousness against his will as well as for her attempt to restore the situation of 2. 1. 3–4 and control his *ingenium*. Her complaint about the conduct of her funeral and her *mandata* recall Propertius' own *mandata* in 2. 13; the ivy that she commands for her tomb (4. 7. 79–80) recalls the laurel that was to decorate his (2. 13. 33–34), the suggested epitaph (4. 7. 85–86—significantly, a real one this time) recalls his (2. 13. 35–36), and her description of his allegedly negligent conduct of her funeral contrasts markedly with the attentions he expected of her.¹⁴³ Her first words to him in 4. 7 (*perfidie, nec cuiquam melior sperande puellae*) attack the claim of fidelity made in his quasi-epitaph in 2. 13 (*unius hic quondam seruius amoris erat*). A further feature of her return is that she has come, as it were, to “re-epicize” their affair. The Homeric references that abounded in Book 2 are absent from Book 3 (the “Odysseus” and “Penelope” of 3. 12 are Postumus and Aelia Galla, not Propertius and Cynthia); instead, 3. 6 has cast the affair as a scene from a comedy, and this has been maintained in 4. 5, a scene of *erotodidaxis* by a bawd instructing the poet's *amica*. The epic status of the relationship is asserted first by Cynthia, haunting Propertius in 4. 7 as the dead Patroclus haunted Achilles in the *Iliad*, then by Propertius, casting himself in 4. 8 as a faithful Penelope and Cynthia as a wandering Odysseus. This pair, which comes after the second rupture of the lovers, recalls another pair, 2. 8 and 9, that immediately preceded the first rupture: In 2. 8 he was Achilles raging over the loss of Briseis and losing Patroclus in the process; in 2. 9 she was again not the faithful Penelope waiting faithfully for her beloved's return.

Cynthia's ghostly return is the last of the four poems (one in each book: 1. 3, 2. 29, and 3. 6 are the others) where she addresses the poet. Her words become increasingly harsh over the four books and are delivered at increasing degrees of distance; by 3. 6 the lovers are reduced to communicating through an intermediary, and in 4. 7 the physical and emotional distance is so great that she must come back from the dead to

¹⁴³ He wanted her to follow his bier, tearing her breast (2. 13. 27), but did not follow hers (4. 7. 29–30); he wanted her to cry out his name (2. 13. 28) but did not call out hers (4. 7. 23); he wanted her to give his corpse a final kiss (2. 13. 29) but did not even attend her obsequies (4. 7. 27–28); he wanted an expensive onyx jar filled with perfumes of Syria (2. 13. 30) but she received neither nard nor cheap hyacinths (4. 7. 32–33).

harangue him. Her speech in 4. 7 has usually been interpreted in a predominantly sympathetic and sentimental way, though a few dissenters have detected humorous elements;¹⁴⁴ in fact the entire speech is, no less than 4. 8, a comic *tour de force* and raises to new heights of sublime absurdity Cynthia's selfish and vindictive bitchiness. Surely we are not meant to sentimentalize a woman who with her first words unjustly accuses Propertius of faithlessness (even though we see him sleeping alone and dreaming only of her), then declares him incapable of behaving otherwise with any woman (13 *perfide, nec cuiquam melior sperande puellae*); who casts in his teeth a sarcastic parody of one of his own conceits (24 *unum impetrassem te reuocante diem*; cf. 2. 27. 15–16 *si modo clamantis reuocauerit aura puellae, / concessum nulla lege redibit iter*); who is capable of saying, after 36 lines of carping and complaining, "But I'm not attacking you, Propertius" (49 *non tamen insector*), then gives the knife one more twist by adding *quamuis mereare*, "even though you deserve it"; nor can we take seriously someone who confirms her veracity by saying, "May a viper hiss on my tomb if I'm lying" (53–54 *si fallo, uipera nostris / sibilet in tumulis et super ossa cubet*); nor should we suppress our smiles over those sessions of heart-to-heart "girl talk" with the likes of Andromeda and Hypermnestra in which Cynthia so thoughtfully conceals the poet's persistent perfidy (70 *celo ego perfidiae crimina multa tuae*), or over the picture of Charon counting up all the souls on holiday as they come flitting back before curfew (89–92). Further humour may lurk in Cynthia's enumeration of her household slaves, of whom she names six; each one has a significant Greek name, but only in the last and most obvious case—Latris, whose name means "maid"—does she note the etymology. At the very least this is comical pedantry on her part, but perhaps the failure to identify the other etymologies deflates the pretensions of the *docta puella* by suggesting a limited knowledge of Greek.

Whether or not she herself is depicted humorously, Cynthia's mission is intimately connected with the poetic argument of the tribiblos as a whole and of Book 4 in particular. Rejected by the poet, she has come to reject him, in the spirit of the employee who, having been sacked, tells his employer, "You can't fire me because I quit." She tells him, almost offhand, to burn all the poems written in her name,¹⁴⁵ those through which he won immortality thanks to an *ingenium* created by her and which he claimed were to be the everlasting monument of her *forma* (4. 7. 77–78):

¹⁴⁴ For the poem in general, see J. Warden, *Fallax Opus: Poet and Reader in the Elegies of Propertius*, Phoenix Suppl. 14 (Toronto 1980) and R. Dimundo, *Properzio 4,7: Dalla variante di un modello letterario alla costante di una unità tematica* (Bari 1990). The principal proponents of the humorous interpretation have been A. K. Lake, "An Interpretation of Propertius 4. 7," *CR* 51 (1937) 53–55 and E. Lefèvre, *Propertius Ludibundus* (Heidelberg 1966) 108 ff.

¹⁴⁵ It is possible that *meo . . . nomine* indicates specifically the monobiblos, if its title was indeed *Cynthia*. It is worth noting in this connection that Propertius uses his own name in every book of the tribiblos but never in the *Cynthia*.

et quoscumque meo fecisti nomine uersus
ure mihi: laudes desine habere meas.

She is attempting to reverse as completely as possible the situation of 2. 11 + 13, stripping from him the everlasting fame that he claimed in 13 and claiming for herself the epitaph and *memoria* that he denied her in 11. She tells him to write no more about her (which was of course precisely his intention) or, as she modestly puts it, to stop praising her. If she will no longer be his *domina*, then he will no longer be her poet. Instead, she will be her own poet, and she has written an epitaph that she styles *dignum me* (surely with the implication that his poetry was not); and, in a correction of the threat embodied in 2. 11, she will produce her own monument to herself, needing Propertius only to secure its erection and inscription (4. 7. 83–86):

hic carmen media dignum me scribe columna,
sed breue, quod currens uector ab Vrbe legat:
“hic Tiburtina iacet aurea Cynthia terra:
accessit ripae laus, Aniene, tuae.” 85

In marked contrast to Propertius' own exclusive, Callimachean burial in 3. 16,¹⁴⁶ Cynthia's will be by the roadside; ivy will mark her status as a poet, just as laurel marked his in 2. 13;¹⁴⁷ and the inscription will be short enough that passers-by can read it without stopping, just like a roadside billboard (contrast the situation in 2. 11. 5–6, where the *uiator* will pass by her remains without noticing and will speak no words over them); unlike Propertius' own projected epitaphs, which emphasized his relationship with Cynthia, hers recalls only herself and the glory she brings to the Anio. In an act of monumentally shortsighted and egoistical vindictiveness she would substitute for everything that Propertius wrote in her honour a single unremarkable couplet of her own. With the literary link broken, she pronounces the erotic bond dissolved as well, at least for now (4. 7. 93–94):

nunc te possideant aliae, mox sola tenebo:
mecum eris et mixtis ossibus ossa teram.

She cares not whom he loves during what remains of his life, only that once he enters the Underworld she will be able to enjoy that exclusive possession which he had expressed as an ideal in 2. 1; but her words are less a promise of love beyond the grave than a threat of skeletal harassment and even of rape.

¹⁴⁶ 3. 16. 25–27 *di faciant, mea ne terra locet ossa frequenti, / qua facit assiduo tramite uulgu iter: / post mortem tumuli sic infamantur amantum*. The Callimachean associations of this burial are noted by Lyne 137; contrast with this the “epic” burial anticipated in 2. 13, where his tomb would be as celebrated as that of Achilles.

¹⁴⁷ The regular association of ivy with poets' tombs imposes acceptance of Sandbach's *pone for pelle* in 79.

Cynthia's return has an important programmatic function: Propertius has announced that he intends to write poetry unrelated to her (and has in fact already done so), and she is made effectively to sanction that intention. Horos had warned in 4. 1. 139–46 that she continues to dominate him, and she has indeed made her way back into his consciousness in a way that suggests she does so against his will. But he does write one final elegy about her. This can be regarded as “correcting” the impression of fidelity which Cynthia created in 4. 7, inasmuch as it shows Propertius being unfaithful only in reaction to Cynthia's faithlessness. More significantly, however, it absorbs Cynthia within his new Callimachean poetic programme. The poem as a whole is introduced as explaining the cause of a late-night row on the Esquiline, as an *aition* in effect,¹⁴⁸ though of a singularly undignified occurrence; Cynthia herself becomes the occasion for an *aition* describing a ritual at Lanuvium which involved a test of virginity—a very ironic event for her to attend, as Pound and others have observed, but especially so after the protestations of fidelity in 4. 7. There may also be programmatic significance in the poetically suggestive names of the two women with whom Propertius seeks to commit his own infidelity for revenge, Phyllis and Teia.¹⁴⁹ The relapse is constituted by the account in 71 ff. of how Cynthia successfully laid siege to his house and dictated terms of surrender, and of how the two effected a sexual reconciliation; though she no longer guides his *ingenium* and therefore his poetic programme, she does retain dominion over his body and bed.¹⁵⁰ There is also a kind of literary reconciliation here. The expression of time that opens 4. 8 is relative, not absolute: “Learn what happened *last night* upon the Esquiline.” Thus it confers not only upon Cynthia but upon the entire cast of characters a kind of immortality that only literature can impart, for whenever this poem is read, whether in 16 B.C. or in A.D. 1999, it was only “last night” that Cynthia and Propertius, Teia and Phyllis, Lygdamus, the dwarf, and the crowd in the alley were all tumultuously alive; thus he restores, through poetry, the everlasting life that he has said only poetry can confer and had earlier tried to take from her. But 4. 8 does not simply restore Cynthia to life in a kind of compensation for no longer being the “star” of Propertius' poetry; in combination with 7 it is the ultimate virtuosic assertion of Propertius' control over his own *ingenium*. In 7 Cynthia is dead, in 8 she is alive, and we readers, who know her only through the poet's *ingenium*, can never know which corresponds to her actual condition; nothing could demonstrate more dramatically the absolute

¹⁴⁸ 4. 8. 1 *disce quid Esquilias hac nocte fugarit aquosas*; for *disce*, cf. *accipe* at 4. 2. 2.

¹⁴⁹ Teia (“the woman of Teos”) could certainly suggest Anacreontic lyric (cf. Ov. *Ars* 3. 330 *uinosi Teia Musa senis*; *Teia Musa* also at *Rem.* 762), while Phyllis is perhaps sufficiently common a name in Virgil (*Ecl.* 3, 5, 7, and 10) and later in Calpurnius (*Ecl.* 3 and 6) that it could on its own suggest pastoral; Propertius dallies with other literary forms, as it were, but Cynthia—whether woman or book or both—drags him back to love elegy.

¹⁵⁰ 4. 8. 81 *indixit legem: respondi ego, “legibus utar.”*

control that the artist exercises over his subject. Horos had said in 4. 1 that Propertius would weep and would see day or night only according to Cynthia's whim;¹⁵¹ but thanks to the power of poetry, she lives or dies according to his.

Propertius' rejection of his mistress has again culminated in a form of reconciliation, physical and sexual only this time, and the poet is free to continue on his new course. The following elegy on Hercules' foundation of the Ara Maxima, which is surely his most successful imitation of Callimachus, uses archaic and elevated language to depict a god in a picturesque and amusing situation very much in the manner of some of the *Hymns*; its extensive use of significant repetition in particular recalls the *Loutra Pallados*.¹⁵² The penultimate elegy on the *spolia opima* and the temple of Jupiter Feretrius offered less scope for charm (though the lament for Veii constitutes an undeniably attractive digression), but it is nonetheless resolutely faithful to Callimachean principles; not unlike the Actium elegy, it describes something that belongs to epic—single combats of leading warriors—without the slightest hint of violence in the language. The final elegy, the so-called *regina elegiarum*, is a last homage to the imperial family, exalting in Augustus' step-daughter all the traditional virtues so conspicuously lacking in Propertius' Cynthia.

* * *

The second part of this paper has used the internal evidence of structural design and thematic continuity to bolster the theory that was deduced in the first part from the external evidence of the ancient citations of Propertius, namely that Books 2–4 represent a single unified work in three books. It has done this by giving an account of the most obvious aspect of unity in the tribiblos, the skeleton of programmatic elegies that holds it together. Only these three books contain such programmatic elegies, which deal explicitly with the issues of Propertius' poetic direction and inspiration and deal with them in precisely the same terms, Cynthia-poetry vs. other poetry (Roman epic first, then imitation of Hellenistic elegy), and Cynthia as inspirer of his poetry (Book 2 *passim*; 4. 1; 4. 7) vs. Apollo and Calliope (denied in 2. 1. 3; affirmed tentatively in 3. 3, positively in 4. 6).¹⁵³ The

¹⁵¹ 4. 1. 143–44 *illius arbitrio noctem lucemque uidebis, / gutta quoque ex oculis non nisi iussa cadet*.

¹⁵² For repetition in 4. 9 see, for example, 13–14 *furem . . . furis*, 16–18 *ue, boues, / Herculis ite boues . . . / bis mihi quaesitae, bis mea praeda, boues*, etc.; it is in fact so pervasive that the apparent repetition of 42 in 66 (for both lines the archetype read *accipit haec fesso uix mihi terra patet*) may well be intentional, requiring only minor verbal alteration rather than wholesale deletion of one or the other. For similar repetitions in Call. *H.* 5, cf. 1–2 *ἔξτε πᾶσαι, / ἔξτε*, 40–41 *Κρείον δ' εἰς ὅρος ὤκισατο, / Κρείον ὅρος*, 72–74 *μεσαμβρινὰ . . . ἄσυχια / . . . μεσαμβρινὰ δ' ἔσαν ὥραι, / πολλὰ δ' ἄσυχια* . . .

¹⁵³ Horos' claim at 4. 1. 133–34 that Apollo intervened early in Propertius' development (*tum tibi pauca suo de carmine dictat Apollo / et uetat insano uerbera tonare Foro*) is not to be

programmatic elegies themselves are not political evasions, nor are they monotonous variations on the insipid theme of *recusatio*. Rather they articulate the well-defined stages of a coherent and logical poetic development; and, together with the erotic elegies which form the flesh and sinews around this skeleton, they represent a literary and erotic "biography" of the *persona* that Propertius has created here (the disjunction between that *persona* and the "real," historical Propertius precludes the more obvious term "autobiography"). The "Propertius" of the tribiblos begins as a natural poet who writes love poetry simply because he is in love with Cynthia; this poetry wins him a place of importance among his Roman contemporaries, a success which then prompts him to define a new position, now within the Greek tradition, as imitator of learned Hellenistic elegy; and he achieves a partial realization of this ambition, while resisting Cynthia's persistent influence, in the poems of Book 4 that form part of his Roman *Aetia*. These rising ambitions toward the emulation of difficult Greek models are counterbalanced by the decline in the relationship with Cynthia. As that affair (seldom deliriously joyful) sours and is twice threatened by bitter separation, Propertius must work out what kind of poetry, if any, will replace love elegy, which was the only kind of poetry that he was inherently capable of writing when he declared at the start of Book 2 that his creativity depended upon his experience of Cynthia. His search for an alternative is represented as a distinctly diffident process. In 2. 1 and 2. 10 Propertius' ambitions are, so to speak, "self-interrupted," as he twice declares himself capable of writing only love poetry, not epic. In 3. 1-3 he *dreams* that he got as far as beginning a Roman epic but was interrupted by Apollo and Calliope and directed to the imitation of learned Hellenistic elegy. He finally tries to achieve that ambitious goal in 4. 1 by imitating Callimachus' *Aetia*, only to be interrupted by the astrologer Horos, and his success or failure is left for the reader to judge.

Right from the start of Book 2 Propertius has a potential alternative to Cynthia-poetry in mind, and before his "discovery" of Callimachean *ars* in Book 3 this alternative is epic poetry celebrating the wars of Augustus (past wars in 2. 1, future wars in 2. 10); Propertius asserts openly and explicitly in 2. 1 that he would write epic for Augustus (and Maecenas) on such subjects as the victory at Actium if his talents lay in that direction rather than being Cynthia's creation. As early as 2. 5 there are hints of difficulty in the relationship with Cynthia; the threat to find a new mistress who will be willing to become famous in his poetry anticipates the two attempted rejections that will follow. The bitter disappointment with Cynthia apparent above all in such elegies as 2. 8 and 9 leads Propertius in 2. 10 to initiate his

taken as Propertius' own statement about his background. Rather it should be seen as a garbled, inaccurate observation based (if on anything in Propertius at all) on misunderstandings of Propertius' own programmatic elegies (Apollo's commands from 3. 3. 15-24, the eschewing of thunder from 2. 1. 39-42); as with everything the astrologer says, its credibility is seriously in doubt.

first attempt to reject Cynthia (and Cynthia-poetry) and to embrace a new poetic programme: He announces that Cynthia is finished as his subject and that the time has come to write the proposed Augustan epic. Immediately, however, he acknowledges that his lingering affection for Cynthia and the nature of his inspiration make this impossible; he expresses this by saying that Amor has forbidden him to abandon "tender songs," i.e. love elegy—an elegant poetic fiction designed to explain why his *persona* is not writing something that Propertius himself had no intention of writing. Propertius is forced to retreat from his pledge, offering an epigram instead of an epic. This epigram (2. 11) signifies the end of the affair and of the poetry derived from it; in effect it declares Cynthia dead and forgotten without the vivifying medium of his poetry to celebrate her, but when he anticipates his own demise in 2. 13 (for both lovers, death without poetry is naturally the alternative to immortality through poetry), he asserts that his own tomb, by contrast, will be celebrated and honoured. This attempted rejection is followed almost immediately by a reconciliation with Cynthia; since his *ingenium* is still guided by her, this enables him to continue as a love poet. He is still the poet of Cynthia at the end of Book 2 and is celebrated as such; but unfortunately our texts of the programmatic elegies 2. 30 and 34 are so corrupt that we cannot see clearly how Propertius began to associate himself (and Cynthia) with the Muses in the former, or how precisely he was introduced to Philitas and Callimachus in the latter. In any case, it is to these canonized representatives of learned Hellenistic elegy that Propertius turns at the opening of Book 3 in search of a new direction, asking to be instructed in their art; his ambition is evidently to become the first Latin writer to compose imitations of learned Hellenistic elegy. His appeal to these figures apparently has its origin in a dream (3. 3). Here he dreamed (in a dream that is surely inspired by its Callimachean equivalent) that he had the capacity to write epic that he denied in 2. 1 and that he accordingly began a monstrous and clearly impossible annalistic epic (less "Ennian" than "super-Ennian") that was to take Roman history from its beginnings right to 29 B.C. But he further dreamed that Apollo and Calliope, whose direction was denied in 2. 1, told him what kind of poetry he ought to write, namely learned elegy in imitation of Callimachus and Philitas, and that Calliope "consecrated" him with the water of Philitas within his Callimachean dream—another elegant fiction that again explains why "Propertius" is not writing something that Propertius would not, though now it is the influence of Apollo and Calliope that is decisive, not Cynthia's. In 3. 9, which marks the midpoint of the collection, he has apparently taken these divine injunctions to heart. He declares himself eager to be recognized as a worthy follower of precisely those Greek models; paradoxically, however, he is still offering to treat such traditional epic themes as Augustus' victories (as promised in 2. 1 and 10) and the origins of Rome (with which his *Annales* began in 3. 3); these might at first glance seem incompatible with imitation of those models. As to the love

affair, to which Propertius has stepped back from these new ambitions in 3. 2, it is troubled and strained throughout Book 3; the lovers are never seen together, and the poems dealing with the affair are largely imbued with frustration, disappointment, and the desire for escape. Once again, at the very end of Book 3, Propertius attempts a rejection of Cynthia; this time he does not state what kind of poetry he will write instead, but in 4. 1 we find him already writing aetiological poetry on the origins of Rome. Only later in 4. 1 does he state the new programme explicitly: He is consciously and decisively rejecting his former Ennian strivings and instead imitating Callimachus in a Roman equivalent of the *Aetia*. Thus he satisfies the ambition announced at the opening of Book 3 to emulate Callimachus and Philotas; reconciles the paradoxes of 3. 9 by celebrating Rome's origins in an imitation of learned Greek elegy; and will fulfill in 4. 6 the promise made explicitly or implicitly in 2. 1, 2. 10, and 3. 9 to celebrate the Actian victory, but will do it within the style of Callimachean elegy, not Ennian epic. Propertius' ambition is immediately challenged by the astrologer Horos, who insists that Cynthia continues to dominate the poet (as Propertius himself used to affirm in Book 2). The aetiological poems that follow (especially 4. 2 and 4) seem to show that the poet is succeeding; but in 4. 5, in a context of *erotodidaxis*, Propertius writes of someone as his *amica*, as though he has lapsed back into his role as love poet. The ambitious 4. 6 aggressively reasserts the new programme by appealing to Apollo and Calliope for inspiration and by proclaiming the stylistic influence of both Callimachus and Philotas; but Cynthia does return in 4. 7. She comes as though she were still the figure of inspiration that she was in Book 2, presuming to guide the course of Propertius' poetry (albeit in a direction fully compatible with the path that he has already set for himself); and she comes in a dream, as Apollo and Calliope first did in 3. 3. The manner of her return suggests that she is forcing herself upon the poet's consciousness against his will, as if to confirm Horos' warning about her continuing dominance. Her condition reflects the rejection threatened in 2. 11: Without his poetry she is stripped of her *munera*, unremembered, and without a monument. She asserts her fidelity and innocence, and by haunting him in an explicit reminiscence of Patroclus haunting Achilles she tries to restore to the affair the tragic depth of the epic *Iliad*. She also tries to reverse the terms of that earlier rejection in 2. 11: By commanding him to erect a monument for her with an epitaph of her own composition and to destroy the earlier Cynthia-poetry on which his renown depended, she seeks to ensure that her own name will live and his will not. But Propertius returns to Cynthia in 4. 8, now not as a haunted lover but as a poet in control of his own *ingenium*. He "corrects" her Iliadic reference, painting the affair instead as a comic *Odyssey*; and he concedes her erotic dominance by grovelling in subservience. But, more significantly, he also absorbs her within his new programme of aetiological poetry by making the poem another *aition*; in the process he achieves, for the only time in his career, a

synthesis of his Cynthia-poetry and his imitation of Hellenistic elegy, creating a novel and original Callimachean erotic elegy. He follows his last Cynthia-poem with another imitation of Callimachus in 4. 9—one, however, that perhaps suggests a nostalgia for love elegy by casting Hercules at the shrine of the Bona Dea as a supplicatory *exclusus amator*. But no such erotic *color* affects 4. 10, an austere and thoroughly Callimachean *aition* that shows that Propertius can indeed wear the mantle of the “Roman Callimachus.”

One final issue remains to be addressed in connection with the Propertian tribiblos: chronology. While most of Propertius’ elegies are impossible to date absolutely, it does seem clear that in general each book is later than its predecessor, for all the datable allusions of Book 4 are later than those of 3, which are in turn later than those of 2. Thus it may seem to some unlikely that these three consecutively written books were intended to stand together as a three-book collection rather than as three independent collections issued one after the other. In fact chronology is no serious barrier to this hypothesis, especially given the fluidity of “publishing” in ancient Rome; it is possible that Propertius planned the project from the beginning, then created and issued it in instalments, or that he originally wrote Book 2 as another monobiblos and then planned 3 and 4 as “sequels” to it.¹⁵⁴ In any case doubts raised by the chronological question ought to be quelled by the evidence of unified structure offered above.

Much more can be said about the tribiblos, about its exploration of human sexuality (in the themes of prostitution, seduction, adultery, and marital love), about how the poet who twice refuses to write an *Iliad* not only defines his lovemaking with Cynthia as “long *Iliads*” but often uses the characters and events of the epic as parallels for his relationship with her, or about how the poet who rejects war in both poetry and life depicts that same relationship as a kind of warfare. But, whatever the reactions to the details of this particular interpretation, the ancient evidence for the publication of Propertius and its implications must finally be taken seriously. The so-called Book 1 was a monobiblos and therefore an autonomous work; in an ideal world we would call it by its probable title *Cynthia* and not Book 1—it was never the first book of anything. Just as certainly, Books 2–4 were published together, not as three unconnected monobibloi, but as a unified tribiblos whose elements were meant to be read together no less than the four books of the *Georgics*; in an ideal world we would cite these books too under their probable title, and Propertius 4. 6, for example, would be known as his *Amores* 3. 6. But the numbering of Propertius’ elegies has been convulsed so many times, by Scaliger and Lachmann and Carutti and Richmond and half a dozen others, that there is not likely to be any great

¹⁵⁴ Similar suggestions were made by Barsby (above, note 8) in connection with Williams’ theory of a joint publication of 1–3. On revision and republication in the ancient Greek and Roman world, see now Cameron (above, note 30) 105–18.

rush to adopt this “new” method of citation in place of the misleading and inaccurate one that now prevails. On the other hand, the knowledge that Propertius intended Books 2–4 as a single work in three books has equally important consequences for our understanding of his art; a linear reading of the tribiblos clarifies significantly the interpretation of the programmatic elegies and the search for the Roman Callimachus. There are consequences as well for the interpretation of Ovid’s *Amores*, for a desire to emulate (and parody) more closely the themes and structure of Propertius’ tribiblos was surely the reason why he reduced its original five books to three. But that is another story.

Memorial University of Newfoundland